

APR 4 1925

VOL. XLVI, 1

WHOLE NO. 181

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

THE

AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COOPERATION OF

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK,
WILFRED P. MUSTARD, D. M. ROBINSON

JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH

1925

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under
the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October
3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Topics from the Life of Ovid. By ARTHUR L. WHEELER,	1
The Decipherment of the Lydian Language. By A. H. SAYCE,	29
Scandinavian Philology. By GEORGE T. FLOM,	52
Horace's Description of a Scene in Lucilius. By TENNEY FRANK,	72
On Tacitus, <i>Agricola</i> , 44, 5. By W. P. MUSTARD,	75
REPORTS:	76
Glotta, Vol. XIII (1923-24) (FRANKLIN EDGERTON).—Philologus, Vol. LXXVIII (1923) (HARRISON C. COFFIN).	
REVIEWS:	84
Owen's P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Liber Secundus (W. P. MUSTARD).—Bailey's The Legacy of Rome (W. P. MUSTARD).—Ferri's Le poesie liriche di Basinio (W. P. MUSTARD).—Jóhannesson's Frumnorraen Málfræði (GEORGE T. FLOM).—Springer's Handbuch der Kunstschriftsteller (WALTER WOODBURN HYDE).—Andreae's Platons Staatschriften, griechisch und deutsch (L. A. POST).—Hagendahl's Studia Ammianeana and Zu Ammianus Marcellinus (CHARLES UPSON CLARK).—Rand's A New Approach to the Text of Pliny's Letters (CHARLES UPSON CLARK; C. W. E. MILLER).—Hagendahl's Die Perfektformen auf -ere und -erunt (CHARLES UPSON CLARK).	
BOOKS RECEIVED:	96

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 50 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLVI, 1

WHOLE No. 181

TOPICS FROM THE LIFE OF OVID.

Biographies of Ovid began to appear in the Middle Ages and became more and more numerous during and after the Renaissance until they culminated in the very careful and erudite *Vita* of ninety quarto pages by John Masson early in the eighteenth century. Masson's work, together with a number of the earlier efforts, which are always incomplete and often absurd, may be found in the Appendix of Burmann's edition, Amsterdam, 1727, a perusal of which will richly reward any scholar who wishes to interest his students in Ovid.

Among Roman poets Ovid is almost the only one of whom something approximating a full and reliable biography can be written, and yet very few modern editors have availed themselves of the opportunity. The accounts of Ovid's life contained in our modern editions are almost always perfunctory, incomplete, and inaccurate.¹ Masson's work is apparently no longer read.

The ancient evidence which must be used to reconstruct the life of Ovid consists chiefly of statements by the poet himself. There are, however, important remarks in other Latin writers, notably Seneca the Elder, and concerning the poet's name and racial affinities some help is derived from inscriptions. Practically all of the literary evidence was well known in the fifteenth century, and Masson prints and discusses almost every scrap of

¹ The best biography in English may be found in S. G. Owen's edition of *Tristia I*, Oxford, 1902, cf. the same scholar's article in the *Eneyel. Britannica*, and, on the causes of Ovid's exile, his recent edition of *Tristia II*, Oxford, 1924. Mr. Owen's work is carefully based throughout upon the ancient material. Many of the editors who do not supply a good biographical sketch make partial amends by printing and annotating the *Autobiog.*, Tr. iv. 10.

it. It is not my purpose to thresh over again all of this old straw, but in a subject of this kind there are always opportunities for new interpretations, and long familiarity with the poems from exile, which contain a very large part of the evidence, has convinced me that here and there even the best of our handbooks can be corrected and supplemented. On some points the neglected views of early scholars can now be better supported and brought back into honor, on others new light can be thrown by considering factors hitherto unobserved, on still others I venture merely to summarize, for reasons of general interest, parts of the ancient evidence. In a few cases the results of recent philological work on other poets may be made to contribute something to the biography of Ovid.

BIRTHPLACE, NAME, RACE.

In the opening lines of his Autobiography Ovid tells us that he was born at Sulmo and, in a genuinely Ovidian periphrasis, that the date was March 20th, 43 B. C. He often mentions his native place, but this reference, Sulmo mihi patria est (Tr. iv. 10, 3), is of special interest because the letters S. M. P. E. have become a sort of municipal device for modern Sulmona, where they occur on public documents, on the façades of monuments, and on the book which is held in the hands of the so-called statue of the poet in the court of the Collegio Ovidio. The Italians delight in honoring their great dead and the poet's name lives not only in the Collegio Ovidio, the chief school of the town, but also in the Corso Ovidio, its main street. A few miles from the town on the steep flank of a mountain lie some Roman supporting walls which are called the Villa Ovidio. Not far away is the Fonte d'Amore, with which in the song and folklore of the region Ovid's name is connected. In the Middle Ages he was a great magician.²

In May, 1922, when the snow still clung to the higher slopes, it was my good fortune to visit the region, and a beautiful region it is. Probably no lovelier vale exists in the world. As one looks down upon it from the heights traversed by the railway,

² On this paragraph cf. M. Besnier in the *Mélanges Boissier* (1903), pp. 57-63.

it is still, as Ovid describes it, *geldig uberrimus undis*—like a great, well-watered garden backed by mountains which tower more than eight thousand feet above the sea. All this beauty is unknown to the average tourist, for there are no good hotels! And so it happens very fortunately that the town preserves its ancient simplicity and is quite unspoiled by crowds of souvenir hunters.

Sulmo was one of the chief towns of the Paelignian race whose glory Ovid calls himself (*Am. iii, 15, 8*) and his family was of old equestrian standing (*Tr. iv, 10, 7 f.*). Thus in the main, although the cognomen Naso probably indicates, as we shall see, a Latin strain, the poet's blood was that of the Paelignian stock; he belonged to one of those sister peoples of the Latins whose common mother we call the parent Italic race. They spoke a dialect which must have been closely allied to Oscan, and in the great rising of the Italian allies against Rome the Paelignian town of Corfinium, renamed Italicum, had been selected as the capital of these 'Confederate States of Italy.' But in Ovid's time the Paeligni considered themselves part of the great Roman commonwealth.

That Ovid's family was in fact Paelignian is shown by the inscriptions of the region. The name *Ovidius* is found on inscriptions only among the Paeligni, and indeed names in -idius, -iedius, etc., seem to be especially characteristic of that region. Variants of the name are *Oviedis*, *Oviedius*, *Obidius*, and probably *Ofdius* and *Aufidius*.³ W. Schulze in his monumental study of Roman names explains *Ovidius* as a derivative of *Ovius*, originally a praenomen.⁴

The cognomen *Naso*—the name by which the poet always calls himself—is, according to Schulze, genuinely Latin. How long the family had made use of a cognomen is unknown—probably not long, for in the conservative mountain districts two names, not three, were the rule in Ovid's time. It is unknown also how the family came to take a Latin cognomen, but in Ovid's boyhood intimacy with the Messallae there is a hint that the poet's father, very probably his grandfather, had re-

³ Cf. Schulten, *Klio*, II, 192. Of 67 names on inscriptions of Sulmo 10 are of this general type.

⁴ *Abhandl. Göttingen*, 1904, pp. 202, 437.

lations with this great Roman family and so with Rome.⁵ It was hardly the poet, as has been suggested, but perhaps one of these immediate forbears who had a nose of the Cyrano de Bergerac type.

CHRONOLOGY OF OVID'S SCHOOL DAYS AND EARLY LITERARY CAREER.

Ovid's account of his education (Tr. iv, 10, 15-30) begins with his childhood. After giving the date of his birth (Mar. 20, 43 B. C.) and that of his brother (Mar. 20, 44 B. C.) in lines 5-14, he adds (15-16),

protinus excolimur teneri curaque parentis
imus ad insignes urbis ab arte viros.

Cf. 19-20, where he confesses that poetry had stealthy attractions for him while he was still a boy (*iam puer*). Moreover, he states that he and his brother assumed the *toga virilis* during the course of their training (27-30),

interea tacito passu labentibus annis
liberior fratri sumpta mihique toga est,
induiturque umeris cum lato purpura clavo,
et studium nobis, quod fuit ante, manet.

It is clear, therefore, that whether the *insignes urbis ab arte viri* were exclusively rhetoricians or partly the grammatici who had charge of boys before they were entrusted to the rhetoricians, the two brothers were studying in Rome some time, probably some years, before they matured. Now since the *toga virilis* was normally assumed at about the age of sixteen and since boys often entered the rhetorical schools at thirteen or fourteen, we may date Ovid's maturity about 27-26 B. C. and his entrance into the rhetorical schools about 30-29 B. C.

This conclusion is supported by another passage (Ex P. II, 3, 69-82) in which Ovid gives rather precise information about his relations with Messalla Corvinus and his two sons, Messalinus and Cotta Maximus. In this passage, addressed to Cotta, Ovid states that Messalla was the first to give him courage to make

⁵ See below, pp. 6 f.

public his poetry,⁶ that Cotta or Maximus, as Ovid usually calls him, had been *born* his friend and that he (Ovid) had given him the first kisses while he was still in the cradle, and that Cotta's brother (Messalinus) could not recall the time when the poet had first done him reverence. This last is the most important statement for our present purpose. The date of Messalinus' birth has usually been fixed at 36-35 B. C. because he was consul 3 B. C. and the earliest age at which a man could hold the consulship under Augustus' law of 27 B. C. was at the completion of thirty-two full years (Mommsen, *Staatsr.* I², 553 ff.). Moreover Graeber has called attention to the fact that his father, Messalla Corvinus, who was in Athens as a student in 45 B. C., joined Brutus and Cassius, and afterwards Antony, so that he probably had no time to marry before 40 B. C. Thus Messalinus can hardly have been born before 39 B. C. and Graeber prefers 36 B. C.⁷ The testimony of Ovid confirms this

⁶ Cf. also P. I. 7, 28-29 (to Messalinus)

nec tuus est genitor nos infitiatus amicos,
hortator studii causaque faxque mei,

Tr. IV. 4, 27-30 (almost certainly to Messalinus)

nam tuus est primis cultus mihi semper ab annis—
hoc certe noli dissimulare—pater;
ingeniumque meum—potes hoc meminisse—probabat,
plus etiam quam me iudice dignus eram,
deque meis illo referebat versibus ore, etc.

⁷ P. Graeber, *Quaestt. Ovid.* i (1881), p. xvii, cf. *Prosopog. Imp. Rom.* Doubt should not be expressed in the latter work as to whether Messalinus was the older son. Ovid's testimony settles this point. Tib. ii, 5 proves that Messalinus became a XV vir sacris faciundis not later than 19 B. C. and Kirby Smith (note *ad loc.*) infers from the inscr. of 17 B. C. (*Eph. epig.* 8, 233) in which his name is last in the list, that his appointment was then recent. This evidence is in harmony with Ovid's, as Graeber proves, since the quindecimvirate could be held by a mere stripling and Messalinus may have been only fifteen or sixteen at the time of his appointment.

Cotta Maximus was much younger than his brother, but the date of his birth is quite uncertain. If we argue from the date of his consulship, 20 A. D., he may have been born as late as 13-12 B. C. and Ovid often calls him *iuvensis* in the *Ex P.* and (probably) the *Tr.*, i. e. c. 8-17 A. D. Ovid kissed him in his cradle so that his birth cannot be dated earlier than 31 B. C. and the date was probably considerably later since he was old enough in the year of Ovid's exile, 8 A. D., to

conclusion, for the poet's attentions to Messalinus began at a time when the latter was so young that he could not remember them. This must have been when Messalinus was not more than five or six years old, i. e. 31-30 B. C., for Ovid was born in 43 B. C. and could hardly use the word *colere* (P. 2, 3, 79) of his attentions to Messalinus until he himself had passed beyond his early boyhood. On the other hand, if Ovid had been (say) sixteen (27 B. C.) at the time to which he refers, Messalinus would have been old enough, eight or nine, to remember it.

The passage thus supports the date 36-35 B. C. for Messalinus' birth—a date already inferred from that of his consulship, etc.—and also implies that Ovid was in Rome and intimate with the Messallae as early as 31-30 B. C.⁸ In fact the passage implies in general that Ovid, while he was still a boy, was a client of Messalla, cf. especially 73-74, quod cum vestra domus teneris mihi semper ab annis culta sit (cf. also Tr. 4, 4, 27). It is indeed possible that the poet's relations with the family of Messalla began before 31 B. C. and that the boys studied at Rome not only with the rhetoricians but also took there the earlier course under a *grammaticus*.⁹ The couplet (Tr. IV. 10, 15-16)

protinus excolimur teneri curaque parentis
imus ad insignes urbis ab arte viros

certainly allows this interpretation. If this is true, it may be suspected that Ovid's father had some connection with the house

hold some position in Elba, cf. *Ex P.* II. 3, 84. Graeber's date for his birth, 25-24 B. C., is probably not far wrong. The facts indicate that he was the fruit of a second marriage and the *Prosopog.* suggests that his mother may have been a Calpurnia, but Ovid (*Ex P.* iv. 16, 43) implies that she was an Aurelia (so Borghesi). Nipperdey's conjecture (on Tac. Ann. iii. 2) that the consul of 20 A. D. was not this man but his son is refuted by the *Prosopog.*

⁸ De la Ville de Mirmont, *La jeunesse d'Ovide* (p. 51) suggests that Ovid may have been in Rome in 31 B. C., but his only argument is that even if Sulmo possessed a *grammaticus*, Ovid's father (like Horace's) preferred to take him to Rome, and 31 B. C. when Ovid was 12, would have been the normal date.

⁹ Cf. De Mirmont. Masson (pp. 35 f.) dates the arrival of the brothers in Rome and the beginning of their *grammatical* studies c. 34-33 B. C. when they were 9 or 10. He gives no reasons.

of Messalla and that he was thus led to have the boys educated in Rome where they could have the protection and encouragement of the great man. Perhaps Messalla was *patronus* of Sulmo. But at least 31 B. C. is the earliest date at which it is reasonably certain that Ovid and his brother were in Rome.

While Ovid was still a boy and before he assumed the garb of manhood, he was already dabbling in poetry (Tr. iv, 10, 19-30) much to the disgust of his hard-headed old father, who frequently reproofed him, calling poetry a *studium inutile* and clinching his argument with the remark that even Homer left no money! How modern it all sounds! One of the old *Vitae*¹⁰ relates, upon no authority, an anecdote which probably hits off the situation very well. Once, says the author of the *Vita*, when the father was chastising his son for wasting time on verses, the boy cried out (in verse!),

parce mihi! numquam versificabo, pater!

This may be rendered in corresponding doggerel,

Father, O spare me now! Verse I will never compose!

This anecdote is obviously based on the famous lines in which Ovid speaks of the stealthy attractions of the Muse, quotes his father's reproof and his own attempt to write prose, and closes with the confession that verse came to him of its own accord, for whatever he tried to write was verse,

et quod temptabam scribere versus erat.

He 'lisped in numbers,' then, because he could not help himself.

But although he contrasts his brother's aptitude for the bar with his own fondness for poetry, the preparatory grind to which the two boys were subjected contained one study which exactly suited him because it helped him in his poetic composition. This was rhetoric, and in rhetoric he became very proficient, as his works prove superabundantly. But we have other interesting testimony. Ovid does not mention any of his teachers by name.¹¹ Seneca the Elder is more explicit. From

¹⁰ In Villenave's Edition, Paris, 1809, p. ix. See De Mirmont, *op. cit.*

¹¹ Unless, as seems improbable, Gallio was one of his teachers.

him we learn much about Ovid's rhetorical studies and incidentally a good deal about the influence of rhetoric upon his poetry. Indeed Seneca throws so much light upon Ovid's career in the rhetorical schools and the poet's bent for rhetoric is so much a part of himself that I shall be forgiven if I present a brief summary.¹²

OVID IN THE RHETORICAL SCHOOLS.

Seneca's testimony is that of an actual listener. He had heard Ovid declaim. He tells in brief that Ovid was considered a *bonus declamator*; that he was an *auditor* of Arellius Fuscus and Porcius Latro and admired the latter so much that he transferred many of his *sententiae* to his own verses;¹³ that he liked *suasoriae* but rarely declaimed *controversiae* and then only the type called *ethicae*, for the argumentation necessary for *controversiae* was irksome to him.

A few remarks will make Seneca's words clearer. Arellius Fuscus and Porcius Latro, who are undoubtedly included among the teachers whom Ovid calls *insignes urbis ab arte viros* (Tr. iv. 10, 16), were ranked among the four leading rhetoricians of the age.¹⁴ Another of Seneca's four was certainly one of Ovid's friends. This was L. Junius Gallio, who adopted Seneca's oldest son. Ovid addresses to Gallio one of his Pontic Epistles (iv. 11) and Seneca (*Suasor.* 3, 7) quotes a remark of Gallio's about 'his friend' Ovid.¹⁵

It is easy to see why Ovid preferred the *suasoria* to the *controversia*. The *suasoria* was often a sort of speech in character:¹⁶ Alexander considers whether to enter Babylon even though the prophets had threatened him with danger; Cicero debates

¹² The chief passage is *Controvers.* II 2, 8-12, but there are many other references, cf. the Index of A. Kiessling's Teubner text of Seneca (1872).

¹³ The two examples given (Am. I, 2, 11 f. Met. xiii, 121 f.) show that Ovid was influenced by Latro both in his earlier period and in his maturity.

¹⁴ Seneca, *Contr.* x, pr. 13. Quintil. x 5, 18 (of Latro).

¹⁵ This is the interesting passage in which Ovid's principle of imitating Vergil is given; *non subripiendi causa, sed palam mutuandi, hoc animo ut vellet agnoscit.*

¹⁶ Cf. Boissier in Daremberg and Saglio, s. v. *Declamatio.*

whether to burn his writings when promised safety by Antony if he will do so. Thus the young declaimer, having assumed the rôle of some famous personage who was confronting a crisis, could give free rein to his fancy. Ovid's *Heroides* have been called *suasoriae* in verse. He was in his element when he could supply words and sentiments to some lay figure—especially if that figure was feminine. With the *controversia* he had to do something more. The *controversia* was a fictitious civil case, a sort of mock trial—though to the Romans there seems to have been nothing 'mock' about them in spite of the absurdity of many of the cases. Thus the *controversia* involved different points of view, the working up of the case and careful order and argument—all of which put too many fetters on Ovid's exuberant imagination: *molesta illi erat omnis argumentatio*, says Seneca. It is more than likely also that he was not fond of the hard work.

And yet Seneca has preserved in outline one of the poet's infrequent declamations of this type.¹⁷ The case is stated as follows:

A husband and wife swore that neither would survive the other. The husband having set out on a journey to foreign parts sent a messenger to tell his wife that her husband had 'departed' (*decessisse*)! She threw herself from (*se praecipitavit*) a window (?). But she recovered, and her father ordered her to leave her husband. She refused and was disowned.

Ovid defended the husband, taking the line (*color*) that a man deeply in love is without moderation and sense! A love under control which commits no imprudence, no folly, etc. is old man's love: *senes sic amant!* The husband admits his error, promises to be more careful in future. But if the father persists, he says: 'Take back your daughter! I deserve punishment! I will go into exile,' etc. etc.

As ever, Ovid is here the erotic expert, and Boissier in his pleasant little essay¹⁸ on the schools of declamation remarks, 'already at school he was what he always was!'

Ovid must have been very young at the time, for Seneca says:

¹⁷ Controv. II 2 (10).

¹⁸ Printed in Boissier's Tacite, pp. 197-235.

oratio eius *iam tum*¹⁹ nihil aliud poterat videri quam solutum carmen—a fitting comment on Ovid's own statement that whatever he tried to write was verse.

Seneca attaches to his account of Ovid's skill in declamation a striking criticism of his verse: *verbis minime licenter usus est* (i. e. in his declamations) nisi in carminibus, in quibus non ignoravit vitia sua sed amavit.²⁰ In proof of the last statement he relates an interesting anecdote. Once when Ovid's friends suggested that three of his verses ought to be expunged, the poet agreed on condition that he himself should except three which his friends should not be allowed to touch, each side to write out their three for a committee of arbitration. Both sides selected the same three verses! Seneca cites the authority of one of the umpires, Albinovanus Pedo, a good soldier, a poet, and a friend of Ovid's (P. iv. 10), for two of the verses—both Ovidian to the *n*th power:

Semibovemque virum semivirumque bovem,
(a man who was half of a bull and a bull who was
half of a man!)

et gelidum Borean egelidumque Notum
(and chill was the wind of the North! unchill was
the wind of the South!)

The doggerel is not much worse than Ovid's word play! The third verse is not given, but any reader could easily find hundreds in Ovid that would serve. It is extremely interesting to know that the mere prettinesses of Ovid were criticized by his own friends who were so sure of their judgment that they were willing to submit the decision to arbitration. How much Falernian, we wonder, was bet on this occasion!

But Ovid, although he was aware of this weakness, stood to his guns, and Seneca's final remark is worth quoting in full:

¹⁹ Cf. also II, 2, 9, where Seneca, after digressing to show that Ovid imitated Latro, returns to his account of the *controversia* with the words *Tunc autem cum studeret habebatur bonus declamator*, i. e. even in his student days.

²⁰ Cf. Contr. 9, 5, 17, *Ovidius nescit quod bene cessit relinquere—he couldn't let well enough alone!*

ex quo adparet summi ingenii viro non iudicium defuisse ad compescendam licentiam carminum suorum sed animum. aiebat interim decentiorem faciem esse in qua aliquis naevos fuisset. To the poet these pet verses were indeed blemishes, but like the cast in Venus' eye, the courtplaster on the face of an eighteenth-century dame, or the warts on that excellent gentleman to whom Mark Twain once alluded, they were blemishes which served to enhance the beauty of their environment.

The fact that the criticized verses occur respectively in the *Ars amatoria* (II, 24 semibovemque etc.) and the *Amores* (II, 11, 10 et gelidum etc.) furnishes no very precise evidence as to the date of this friendly controversy. It is clear that the verses must have become known either through recitation or publication, but, so far as the *Amores* are concerned, we have no reliable means of assigning this particular poem to any definite date within the long period which began with Ovid's first public recitations of the Corinna poems and ended with the final edition of the whole work. Most of the *Amores*, however, must have preceded the *Ars amatoria* which was published c. 1 B. C. and marks the latest phase of Ovid's erotic poetry. If we date the contest after 1 B. C. we are forced to the conclusion that Ovid, at the age of forty-two or forty-three, was still betting Falernian with his friends on questions of this sort. Such a conclusion is not impossible, but it does not seem very probable. Seneca's picture is one of men who back their opinions with an ardor that is not yet stale, and we may hazard the surmise that the contest occurred after Ovid had recited a part of the *Ars amatoria*—several years before the poem was completed. This is vague, but it is clear at least that the incident may help us to know what manner of man the poet was in the years of his maturity.

FIRST PUBLIC APPEARANCE AS A POET.

Some of the verses which Ovid scribbled in his boyhood were known to his more intimate friends, and it was the great Messalla who, having known Ovid well when the latter was but twelve or thirteen, perhaps still younger, first encouraged him to make his work public.²¹ This first public appearance is described by

²¹ See pp. 4 ff.

the poet in lines which are intended to convey a rather precise indication of his age at the time, Tr. iv. 10, 57-60:

carmina cum primum populo iuvenalia legi
barba resecta mihi bisve semelva fuit.
moverat ingenium totam cantata per urbem
nomine non vero dicta Corinna mihi.

From this passage scholars have inferred that when Ovid first appeared in public to recite, as the context shows, some of the *Amores*, he was from twenty to twenty-five years of age. Within these limits few authorities fix his age at twenty or twenty-one; most prefer twenty-two or more.²² These conclusions are based upon what seems to me a misunderstanding of the evidence and I believe that Ovid was not yet twenty at the time of his earliest *recitationes*.

It should be noticed, before we pass to a detailed examination of the evidence, that the current view does not harmonize well with the rather full information we possess concerning Ovid's early life. We know that, like Catullus and Propertius, he was an extremely precocious literary talent, that he lived in an age devoted to poetry, associated with dozens of poets, and was intimate from boyhood with the family of Messalla in which was centred one of the leading poetic coteries of the day. There is something inherently improbable in the view that such a man did not himself become publicly known as a poet until he had attained the age of twenty-two, or even twenty-four or twenty-five. This view rests upon two lines of argument—both, in my opinion, unsound.

The first point concerns the words *barba resecta . . . bisve semelva*, which are in fact at the centre of the question. In these words scholars have found a reference to Ovid's first shave and the ceremony called the *depositio barbae*. The references to this ceremony show that it might occur when a man was eighteen (Sueton., Calig. 10), twenty-two (id. Nero 11-12), or twenty-four (Dio, 48, 34, 3, of Octavian). It is admitted that no definite age can be fixed for the *depositio*, but since—and this is the second point—the earliest reference in the *Amores* is that

²² Owen prefers twenty, Schanz twenty-two, Masson twenty-one.

to the death of Tibullus (III, 9) in 19 B. C., when Ovid was about twenty-four, some scholars have hesitated to set the date of his *depositio* much earlier. Others, realizing that the references to the *depositio*²³ supply no reliable argument and chiefly influenced by the second point, have inferred that Ovid was twenty-four or twenty-five. This last method has at least the merit of bringing the earliest known reference in the *Amores* into harmony with one of the ages at which the *depositio* is known to have occurred.

Before proceeding to the details of a different interpretation it will be well to examine the preceding lines for possible hints as to chronology. In vv. 41-56 Ovid gives a select list of the poets older than himself whom he revered 'at that time' (*temporis illius*, 41) closing with the names of two, Vergil and Tibullus, who died 19 B. C. Vv. 53-54, suggested by the mention of Tibullus, are a parenthesis on the four elegists. At v. 55 the main thought is resumed, reverting to 41 ff.: As I revered the older poets, so was I revered by the younger, for my poetry quickly became known. The contrast shows that Ovid was still young, although his fame was already secure, at the time which he has in mind, and in order to explain this early fame he emphasizes the fact that he was nevertheless a veteran in poetry, for his first and immediately successful appearance in public had occurred when he was *very* young, 57 ff. *cum primum*, etc.

'That time' which he has in mind is approximately defined by lines 31-40 to which the phrase refers. His brother, who was born March 20, 44 B. C., and was exactly one year older than Ovid (5-14), died at the age of twenty, i. e. 24 B. C. Ovid held the first offices granted to tender youth (33-34), but renounced an official career, when the senate was within his reach, chiefly because of his desire to devote himself to poetry. He was nineteen when his brother died. Possibly his official experience had already begun, but it is not probable, for the triumvirate (probably *triumviratus capitalis*) to which he alludes was one of the posts, collectively called *vigintiviratus* and

²³ On the *depositio* in general, cf. Friedlaender on Petron. cc. 29 and 73, Mayor on Juv. 3, 186, and, with special reference to Ovid, Masson's *Vita*, p. 54.

preliminary to the quaestorship, which were administered by young men of twenty to twenty-three who were destined for the senatorial *cursus*. Moreover the words *curia restabat* and the necessity of deciding that he would remain a knight (35-36) show that Ovid was nearing the quaestorship.²⁴ He was therefore about twenty-three,²⁵ when the Muses claimed him wholly as their own (39-40). The poet is thus thinking of 'that time' which began approximately in 24 B. C. and extended to about 20 B. C. when, on the eve of the quaestorship, he retired from public life. The phrase *barba resecta* must refer to some occurrence within or before this period.

The opening lines of the poem prove, if any proof is needed, that Ovid is writing not merely for the general public but for later generations, and it is not in his manner to be vague. It seems highly improbable, therefore, that in a phrase the very purpose of which is to denote extreme youth he should refer to a ceremony, the *depositio*, which might even on our meagre evidence occur at any time within a space of six years. Who even among his contemporaries would have known at just what age Ovid's *depositio* took place? These difficulties will be removed, however, if the phrase *barba resecta* can be shown to refer, not to the *depositio*, but to another custom the meaning of which was free from such ambiguity—the custom then common, if not universal, among young men of the better classes, of allowing the first beard to grow but keeping it in order by an occasional trimming until the time arrived for the *depositio*. In a word Ovid means that when he first appeared in public as a poet his beard had been trimmed, not shaved, but once or twice.

This interpretation conforms with the ordinary meaning of *resecare*, 'to cut,' 'cut off,' 'clip,' 'shear,' etc. In no one of the dozen instances listed in Burmann's *Index* does the word mean 'to shave,' unless we read that meaning into the phrase under discussion. But statistics as to the meaning of *resecare* (*secare*), *radere* (*abradere*), *caedere* (*recidere*), *tondere*, *metere*, etc. prove little since, as in English, a word meaning 'to cut'

²⁴ Cf. also *Fasti* iv, 374-384: Ovid achieved the perquisite of a senatorial seat at the games. Such privileges were granted before the quaestorship to young men who were looking forward to that office.

²⁵ So Masson, p. 56.

was capable at times of meaning 'to shave,' a kind of cutting. Moreover it might be argued that in poetry of a rather dignified type such as elegy, any term which smacks of the barber-shop would naturally occur infrequently, and in fact there is in Burmann's *Index* not a single case of *radere* or *tondere*, the words which most nearly approach the technical meaning, in the sense of 'shave.' It is of greater moment that the phrase *barba resecta* occurs in two other passages, the first of which helps to define its meaning. In A. A. I, 518, the man who expects to please the ladies should have not only clean teeth, clean nails, etc., but

nec male deformat rigidos tonsura capillos:
sit coma, sit scita barba resecta manu.

Here *resecta* clearly means 'trimmed,' 'clipped.' If it meant 'shaved,' we should have in *coma . . . resecta* the picture of a lover with the tonsure of a convict! In contrast with the neatly cut hair and well trimmed beard of civilized society Ovid describes the long hair and full beards of the Getae, Tr. V. 7, 18:

non coma, non ulla barba resecta manu.

The custom of wearing a neatly trimmed beard was no new thing in Ovid's day. Cicero refers several times²⁶ to those who adopted it—especially to young fellows like Curio, Calvus, and others who were such thorns in the flesh of the great triumvirs—as *barbatuli*. There is in the word a contempt which arises not only from political feeling but also from the half-amused condescension of one of the older generation who had put aside the *barbula* among other childish things. But all *barbatuli* were not contemptible, for the custom was widespread and men of good standing seem not to have shaved regularly until they were about forty.²⁷ Clodia, like the ladies to whom Ovid refers (A. A. I, 518, above), was fond of *barbatuli*, and it is from a passage of the *Pro Caelio* (c. 14) that we gain the clearest conception of the fashion. Speaking of Clodia's lovers, the great orator asks whether he is to deal with her in the harsh,

²⁶ In Cat. ii. 22, ad. Att. 1, 14, 5 (cf. Tyrell and Purser), I, 16, 11. Cf. also Ellis on Catull. 37, 19, T. Frank, *A. J. P.* XL (1919), 397-398.

²⁷ Marquardt, *Privatleben*, p. 600.

old-fashioned style or gently and politely in modern fashion: *si illo austero more ac modo, aliquis mihi ab inferis excitandus est ex barbatis illis—non hac barbula qua ista delectatur, sed illa horrida quam in statuis antiquis et imaginibus videmus.* Ovid's *barba resecta* represents Cicero's *barbula*.

Whether Ovid, like Nero and Trimalchio, ever deposited his beard in a golden box, whether indeed he deposited it at all, we do not know. Certainly in the phrase *barba resecta . . . bisve semelve*, he is describing himself as in the earliest stages of the *barbatulus* period. Even in the hirsute days of old the age when the young beard first needed clipping must have varied somewhat with individuals, as it does to-day. Ovid himself assigns fresh-growing beards to Romulus and Remus at the age of eighteen (F. iii, 59-60), which agrees with the historical case of Caligula who shaved and dedicated his beard at the same age. The author of the *Laus Pisonis* possessed a young beard before his twentieth summer (*Laus Pis.*, 260-261), while Macrobius speaks of a youthful adornment on the cheeks after twenty-one (*In somn. Scipionis*, i. 6). But these cases are mere illustrations. Most young men, if we recall our own youth, begin to shave before they enter college at the age of eighteen, and if it were still the fashion to wear a *barbula*, it is certain that they would be sporting it in freshman year. It is certain also that Ovid must have been normal in this respect or else, when he wished to indicate a definite period of his youth for all men to understand, he would not have described it as the age of his first beard-trimming. On the contrary he used words which he believed would carry a fairly definite meaning, not foreseeing, confident of fame though he was, that his words would be read by generations of men but imperfectly acquainted with the customs and language of his native land.

This somewhat extended tonsorial discussion leads, therefore, to the conclusion that Ovid was reciting his *Amores* in public and became instantly popular when he was but eighteen years of age, c. 25 B. C. The date can certainly not be set much later. The conclusion is in harmony with everything that we know about Ovid, it is in harmony with the fact that in that southern climate the minds of young men mature in many ways more rapidly than is the rule with us, and it is not contradicted

by that reference to 19 B. C. in Am. iii. 9, which has been already mentioned. It is in fact unlikely that this poem is one of the earliest of the *Amores*. The poems which Ovid first recited were inspired by Corinna and the first complete edition of the *Amores* comprised five books. The three-book edition—the only one extant—was pretty certainly formed from the earlier one, chiefly by a process of omission and condensation, for Ovid had a tendency to destroy his work, cf., for example, the passage which immediately follows the one we have been discussing (Tr. iv. 10, 61-64). If the epicede on Tibullus (Am. iii. 9) was ever included in the earlier edition, it must have been one of the later poems—standing, say, in Book IV or V. When Ovid reissued the work in three books he left it in the same relative position so that it now stands in the last book. It is mere accident that it contains the earliest reference in the *Amores*, and indeed the *Amores* contain very few references to anything which can be dated—no others, I think, which are free from doubt.

OVID AND TIBULLUS.

Ovid's list of the older poets whom he revered in his youth (Tr. iv. 10, 41-55) contains seven names. The language indicates that only the first four poets were intimate friends: Aemilius Macer, Propertius, Ponticus, and Bassus. The careful statement about Horace implies at most that he had heard that poet recite, but Horace recited very infrequently²⁸ and perhaps the phrase *tenuit nostras . . . Horatius aures* is purely figurative; certainly there is no evidence that Ovid was ever intimate with him. Vergil he had barely seen, and Gallus cannot properly be included in the list since his name is added merely to complete Ovid's canon of the four elegists. He died in Egypt in 26 B. C., when Ovid was seventeen, and it is doubtful whether Ovid had ever met him.

The passage raises several questions, the most interesting of which, in my opinion, concerns Tibullus—the more interesting because scholars do not seem to have raised it, much less answered it. The reference is in vv. 51-52:

²⁸ Sat. i. 4. 73.

Vergilium vidi tantum nec avara Tibullo
tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae.

Scholars long ago explained the words about Vergil as due to the fact that Vergil's health was frail and in his later years he lived much in retirement at Naples.²⁹

But the statement about Tibullus calls for more explanation than it has received. The tone of the couplet is one of deep regret. Ovid has just named five poets whom he had abundant opportunity to know or hear, but Vergil and Tibullus are linked together as men whom he would gladly have known well if he had had the opportunity. The juxtaposition is important. Ovid's words imply that he was acquainted with Tibullus but that there was not an opportunity, or not a sufficient opportunity, to form that friendship (*amicitia*) which was, at least formally, a closer bond with the Romans than it is with us. He reproaches the *avara fata* for this; ³⁰ Tibullus died so prematurely that Ovid could not become his friend in the time in which this would otherwise have been possible, 19 B. C., and the later years. It seems, therefore, that he had no sufficient opportunity for friendship before 19 B. C.—the year in which, on the authority of Domitius Marsus' famous epigram, Tibullus died:

Te quoque Vergilio comitem non aequa, Tibulle,
Mors iuvenem campos misit ad Elysios,
ne foret aut elegis molles qui fleret amores
aut caneret forti regia bella pede.

Probably the attention of scholars has not been arrested by Ovid's words because of the clear implication that the early death of Tibullus robbed him of the time necessary for friendship with that poet. Satisfied with this they have not asked the question: Why was there not sufficient time before 19 B. C.? The moment we begin to compare what we know of the lives of the two poets before 19 B. C., we see that this question certainly demands an answer.

On Ovid's own testimony Tibullus was the leading Roman elegist after the death of Gallus. Ovid greatly admired him,

²⁹ Cf. Ribbeck, Röm. D., p. 227.

³⁰ Cf. Marsus' *non aequa . . . mors iuvenem*.

often refers to him, paraphrases him at times, and followed his example in many ways. Tibullus was composing and publishing his verse as early as 30 B. C. and continued before the public as late as 22-21 B. C., possibly still later.³¹ Ovid was in Rome by 31-30 B. C. and first came before the public c. 25 B. C. with the same type of poetry as that of Tibullus. Moreover—and this is especially striking—both were intimate with Messalla and his family. It seems at first sight very surprising, therefore, that within the period from 30 to 19 B. C. there was not sufficient opportunity for real friendship between the two poets.

A study of the lives of both shows, however, that opportunities for close and prolonged association were probably rare and at the same time enables us to sketch those lives with a surer hand.

We may begin with certain obvious facts. Messalla was absent from Rome nearly all the time from the campaign of Actium (31 B. C.), in which he took a prominent part, to the date of his triumph over the Gauls of Aquitania, September 25, 27 B. C. Tibullus, who, unlike Ovid and Propertius, was a good soldier³² in spite of his yearnings for the simple life, was with Messalla during the Aquitanian campaign (I. 7, 9) and started with him on an eastern expedition only to be taken ill at Corcyra (I. 3, 1 ff.). Perhaps after his recovery from this illness, he rejoined Messalla in the East. There is, however, no real proof of this, in spite of his long description (I. 7, 13 ff.) of eastern countries, nor is it possible to determine the relative order of the eastern and the Aquitanian expeditions. At any rate Tibullus was absent from Rome for long periods between 31 and 27 B. C., while Ovid at this time was a schoolboy, twelve to sixteen years

³¹ Tib. II. 5, on the induction of Messalinus into the college of *XV viri sacris faciundis* is probably the latest poem of Tibullus. Kirby Smith argues that this poem could not have been written ‘long before the poet’s death in 19 B. C.’ (see p. 24). To this we may add that if Messalinus was born c. 36-35 B. C. (see pp. 5-6), he could hardly have become a *decemvir* before he was fifteen, i. e. c. 21 B. C. Smith, however, considered II. 6 to be the latest poem, but see p. 21 note.

³² *Vita Tibulli*: cuius (i. e. Messallae) etiam contubernalis Aquitanico bello militaribus donis donatus est. Cf. Tibul. I. 7. I do not share the skepticism of Postgate, Michaelis, etc. concerning the trustworthiness of the *Vita*.

of age. Thus until 27-25 B. C. there was probably little opportunity for the two to form more than an acquaintanceship.

What was the situation in 27 B. C. and the years immediately following? Messalla was in Rome for his triumph in 27 B. C. and we may assume that Tibullus shared in that display; he certainly celebrated it along with Messalla's birthday,³³ which occurred at about the same time, although his love for the country may have frequently drawn him away from the city. At about this period Ovid, at Messalla's suggestion, ventured to appear in public and became famous for his poems on Corinna. Here then was an opportunity for Ovid to make the acquaintance of Tibullus, probably in the house of Messalla. But his own statements prove that it could not have been more than an acquaintanceship. The time, therefore, could not have been of long duration, and since Messalla and presumably Tibullus were in Rome or its neighborhood for several years, we may assume that Ovid was absent. This assumption becomes probable when we remember that Ovid both studied in Athens and travelled in Asia and Sicily.

The dates of these journeys have never been fixed on the basis of any reliable evidence, although the student sojourn at Athens has naturally been assigned to some period within Ovid's youth and there has been a general tendency to connect with it the trip to Asia and Sicily. The statements of Ovid are as follows (Tr. I. 2, 77-78) :

nec peto, quas quandam petii studiosus, Athenas,
oppida non Asiae, non loca visa prius.

This passage occurs in the description of a severe storm which burst upon Ovid's ship while he was voyaging from Italy towards

³³ He also alludes to Messalla's reconstruction of the Via Latina (I. 7, 57-62). This was, according to the Prosopog. (III 365) 'apparently' about 26 B. C. Tibullus' words vv. 59-60,

namque opibus congesta tuis hic glare a dura
sternitur, hic apta iungitur arte silex,

indicate that the work was still going on (cf. the present tenses) when he was writing I. 7. 'Apparently,' therefore, seems unnecessary.

Messalla was also appointed Praefectus urbi in 26 B. C., although he resigned that office after five days.

Greece on his way to Tomis. The poem was probably written in the winter of 8-9 A. D. He alludes to Asia and Sicily (Ex Pont. II, 10, 21 ff.):

te duce magnicas Asiae perspeximus urbes,
Trinacris est oculis te duce visa meis;
vidimus Aetnaea, etc.

and then, after mentioning a number of places in Sicily, ending with the region of Syracuse, he says

hic mihi labentis pars anni magna peracta est.

This letter, one of the pleasantest of all the poems from exile, was addressed to Ovid's friend, the poet Macer,³⁴ in reminiscence of their journeys together. Its date is c. 12-13 A. D.

Another reference to Ovid's sojourn in Asia occurs in Fast. VI, 417-424, where he is speaking of the Palladium,

cetera iam pridem didici puerilibus annis,
non tamen idcirco praetereunda mihi
* * * *
creditur armiferae signum caeleste Minervae
urbis in Iliaceae desiluisse iuga.
Cura videre fuit; vidi templumque locumque.

³⁴ This Macer is probably to be identified with Pompeius Macer, the epic poet (P. IV. 16, 6) and the relative of Ovid's third wife (P. II. 10, 10), not with Aemilius Macer, the didactic poet (Tr. IV. 10, 43). Kirby Smith preferred the latter whom he is inclined to identify with the Macer of Tib. II. 6, which he believes to be the latest poem of Tibullus. But Aemilius Macer was already growing old, c. 24 B. C., cf. Tr. IV, 10, 43, and is less likely to have undertaken a foreign campaign, and moreover Tib. II. 6, 1-6 imply that the Macer there mentioned was in love or was a love poet. This harmonizes better with what is known of Pompeius Macer. Further, although Aemilius Macer died in Asia 16 B. C., according to Hieronymus, Pompeius Macer was the son or grandson of Theophanes of Mytilene, Pompey's friend, and would have known Asia well, cf. Schanz, viii. ii, 1, pp. 362-363. Masson, *Vita*, pp. 43-44, suggests that Pompeius Macer is the man whom Augustus sent out as *ἐπίτροπος* of Asia, cf. Strabo, xiii, p. 618 c, and fixes Ovid's journeys c. 27-23 B. C. when he was very young. He emphasizes *puerilibus annis*.

It seems not improbable that Ovid may have accompanied Macer to Asia on the expedition alluded to by Tibullus II. 6. This poem would not in that case be the latest.

Ovid's words do not prove that his visit to Athens and his travels in Asia and Sicily were all included in one long foreign tour, although the fact that in Tr. I. 2 the phrase *oppida . . . Asiae* follows directly on *Athenas* may mean, and has been taken to mean,³⁵ that he went on from Athens to Asia and thence to Sicily, cf. Ex. P. II. 10. On the other hand it would not be safe to press the phrase *puerilibus annis* in the Fasti passage and infer that this was a different and an earlier visit to Asia. Such trips were not usually made until a boy's schooldays were over. But whether the journeys were closely connected or not, it seems probable, in view of the failure of Ovid and Tibullus to contract a friendship, that these absences of Ovid from Rome occurred during the period in which the two poets might otherwise have seen each other often, c. 27-19 B. C. This probability is strengthened by Ovid's implication that he could have become a friend of Tibullus if the latter had only lived longer—that, in fact, Ovid himself was in Rome for several years after 19 B. C., the year of Tibullus' death.

The sojourn in Sicily lasted *pars anni magna*, and if Ovid seriously devoted himself to study in Athens, he must have remained there several months. When we add to these months the time necessary to visit even the coast cities of Asia—the claras *Asiae urbes*, as Catullus called them—and when we remember how leisurely the Romans were wont to travel,³⁶ two years are not an excessive estimate of the entire absence from Rome. It is impossible to determine whether he made only one journey or more than one. If there was but one, there would have been time for it in the years 28-26 B. C., after Ovid had completed the more formal part of his education, or in 25-23 B. C., just after his literary *début*. There is no good reason for choosing between these two possibilities. The first becomes more probable if we emphasize *puerilibus annis* (F. vi. 417) and *studiosus* (Tr. i. 2, 77), the second if we assume that Ovid may have been called home by the death of his brother, the news of which could have reached him late in 24 or early in 23 B. C., just as, in an earlier generation, Catullus had been called away from his pleasures by a like sorrow.

³⁵ Cf. De Mirmont, *op. cit.*

³⁶ Cf. for example, Cicero's journeys to and from his province.

But although Ovid's journeys cannot be precisely dated, they must have occurred in the earlier rather than the later part of the period which closed with the death of Tibullus, since Ovid's brief official career can hardly have begun later than c. 23-22 B. C. Ovid and his brother were among those youths of good equestrian family who were destined from boyhood for the *cursus honorum* and wore as a symbol the laticlave (Tr. IV, 10, 29), which to be sure Ovid later 'narrowed,' i. e. renounced (*ib.* 35). It is fair to assume, therefore, that, brilliant as he was, he held the minor offices at the earliest possible age, and indeed he uses the phrase *tenerae primos aetatis honores* (*ib.* 33). Without overemphasizing the fact that this reference follows immediately the account of his brother's death, 24 B. C., he could not have been over twenty or twenty-one at the time so that 23-22 B. C. is a probable date³⁷ for the beginning of his official experience. In deference to his father's wishes, which must have been all the more urgent after the death of the older boy who had displayed such talent for the forum, Ovid persisted until, as I have suggested, the quaestorship was imminent, c. 20 B. C.

Just how onerous the duties of these minor officials were we do not know, but at least during his incumbency Ovid would have had much less time than usual for literature and literary friendships. The duties were heavy enough to provide him with a pretext for his renunciation of the senatorial career, Tr. IV, 10, 36-37:

maiis erat nostris viribus illud onus.
nec patiens corpus nec mens fuit apta labori.

His attitude is that of a young man who had no taste for official life, who shunned hard work, and whose experience of the labor required by his first positions was quite enough. He saw ahead of him more and still harder work, and he shrank from it.

³⁷ So Masson, p. 46. Ovid may also have been in these years a decemvir stlit. iud. (F. 4, 384) although Mommsen (Staatsr. I², p. 504) denies that a single individual could hold two of the offices included in the vigintivirate and favors emending the Fasti passage to bis decem. Ovid's activity as a centumvir (Tr. II, 93-94, P. III, 5, 23-24) and as a private iudex (Tr. II, 95) cannot be assigned to any definite period.

It is, therefore, clear that down to about 21-20 B. C. there were obstacles connected with Ovid's own life which go far to explain the absence of an *amicitia* between him and the country-loving Tibullus. How is it with the life of Tibullus?

In 1912 Professor B. L. Ullman revived and placed on a firmer basis the view that Tibullus, for some time before his death in 19 B. C., was in retirement and far from well.³⁸ He accomplished this by a careful interpretation of Horace's Ode, I. 33, 1-4, and especially the Epistle I. 4, both of which are addressed to Albius, an elegist. This Albius, as the vast majority of scholars believe, cannot very well have been anybody else than Tibullus, and I do not intend to review the arguments. Rather I shall here supply further evidence for the correctness of Ullman's chief contention: that when rightly understood Horace's words testify to the ill health of Tibullus and to his own desire to divert his friend's mind from brooding and to cheer him up. Horace is aware that Tibullus has had a long fit of the blues and is really worried about him, but he puts on a bold face and says in effect, 'cheer up, old friend! You're all right if you'll only be sensible and think so.' If the epistle does not mean something like this I do not know what it means. To take it literally gives it a meaning so slight as to be unworthy of the mature wisdom of Horace when he was writing the Epistles.

Now this interpretation of Horace is supported by the fact that Ovid found no sufficient opportunity to establish a friendship with Tibullus. To the obstacles in the way of that friendship we may add the ill health of Tibullus which sent him into retirement some time before his death. Indeed the facts derived from Ovid render it probable that his retirement continued for a longer period than can be inferred from Horace alone, a year or two before 19 B. C.—the very period in which Ovid abandoned his official duties and gave himself over entirely to poetry.

All the facts suggest a date for Horace's epistle not long before the premature death of Tibullus. There has been a tendency, not unnatural under the circumstances, to fix the date of the ode also as late as possible, c. 23 B. C. But the ode is in Book I and it may therefore belong to a time considerably

³⁸ *A. J. P.*, XXXIII, pp. 153-160.

earlier. Tibullus was pretty certainly in Rome at the time of Messalla's triumph, in September, 27 B. C., and the ode may very well be assigned to the years immediately following when Tibullus was engaged upon the elegies of his second book, which he left incomplete and did not himself publish. In this case the ode bears witness to a fit of melancholy some years before that illness of Tibullus which is implied by the epistle.

The foregoing comparative study has thrown new light, as I believe, upon the lives of the two leading poets of Messalla's circle from about 27 to 19 B. C. It is impossible, of course, to determine the exact sequence or the exact chronological limits of details to which we have such incomplete references, but it may be hoped that the conclusions arrived at are not lacking in probability.

OVID'S WIVES AND STEPDAUGHTER.

Ovid was married three times, cf. Tr. IV. 10, 69-74. The first wife was given to him, probably at his father's command, when he was hardly more than a boy (*paene . . . puero*) and he characterizes her as *nec digna nec utilis*. The union was soon broken. He praises his second wife rather faintly as *sine crimine*, but this union also did not endure. His words leave the manner of his separation from these wives quite uncertain; he mentions neither death nor divorce. Nothing more is known of them except that one came from Falerii (Am. iii, 13, 1) and one must have been the mother of Ovid's daughter—probably the second wife, for, as has been conjectured,³⁹ Ovid would hardly have wounded his daughter's feelings by calling her mother, in his published work, *nec digna nec utilis*.

For his third wife Ovid seems to have had a real affection. She is frequently addressed in the poems from exile, almost always in very affectionate terms. Very rarely there is a note of peevishness arising from the poet's despairing feeling that she was not doing her utmost to secure a mitigation of the terms of his exile. There is no reason to think, however, that she did not do her best.

There is some evidence, though it is by no means conclusive, by which to approximate the date of Ovid's third marriage. The fact that his third wife had been married before and had a

³⁹ Cf. Owen, Ed. Trist. I, p. xviii, citing Constantius Fanensis.

daughter by this marriage is of little service in the effort to infer her age at the time of her marriage to Ovid, since Roman girls were often brides when very young. She might have been still very young when she came to Ovid. There is, however, some reason to think that she was past the first bloom of youth. In *Pont.* I. 4, 47 ff. Ovid speaks of her as *iuvensis* at the time when he left Rome, adding that she may have aged, as he has, because of his misfortunes; that her hair, like his, may have turned gray. This letter was written 12 or 13 A. D. and Ovid had left Rome 8 A. D. If there is any reality beneath Ovid's words, if he is considering the possibility a real one that her hair may have become gray in four or five years, then we should probably picture her as a lady between thirty and forty at the time of Ovid's writing, and he may have married her twenty years earlier (say) 8 B. C. This is, of course highly conjectural, but we may reach approximately the same result by other evidence.

This wife's daughter (Ovid's stepdaughter) was married to *Suillius* (*P. iv.* 8, 11-12)—not later, therefore, than 16-17 A. D. Now if this step-daughter is, as I am convinced, the same as the *Perilla* to whom *Tr. iii.* 7 is addressed, she was old enough to write poetry which Ovid thought worth criticizing before the date of his exile, that is, she may have been fifteen or sixteen in 8 A. D. If this is true, her mother was, at the same date, thirty or more, so that Ovid's allusion c. 12-13 A. D. to her gray hair, some five years later, becomes quite intelligible. It becomes fairly probable, therefore, that Ovid's third marriage can hardly have taken place later than c. 9-8 B. C.

There are two common misstatements current about Ovid's third wife: that her name was *Fabia*, and that she was the mother of Ovid's daughter. The second statement has already been corrected by implication, and there is no evidence to support it. The evidence against it is negative but is very strong: in the numerous passages addressed to his third wife Ovid never alludes to 'our' daughter. He alludes thrice to his own daughter (*Tr. IV.* 10, 75-76, *I.* 3, 19-20, *F. vi,* 219 ff.). From these passages we learn that she was married twice in her early youth, had a child by each husband, and was absent in Libya at the time of Ovid's parting from his wife.

The passage from which the inference has been made that

Ovid's third wife was a Fabia is P. I, 2, 136, where, addressing Paullus Fabius Maximus, Ovid says,

ille ego de vestra cui data nupta domo est.

His wife, then, who is proved by the following lines to have been acquainted with Marcia, Fabius' wife, and Atia Minor, Augustus' aunt, was 'from the house' of the Fabii. This does not prove that her name was Fabia, but merely that she was connected with or dependent on the Fabii.⁴⁰

At any rate she was a lady of good social position, and both she and Ovid considered it wise that she should not share his exile, but should remain in Rome to work for his recall. They hoped that through Marcia and Atia she could influence Livia to appeal to Augustus.

Allusion has just been made to the probable identity of Ovid's stepdaughter, the daughter of his third wife, with Perilla, the young poetess to whom Tr. iii. 7 is addressed. Great confusion still prevails, in editions of Ovid, concerning Perilla. All the editors see that she wrote poetry and many of them are content with that. A few warn the reader correctly that she was not Ovid's daughter, but this warning has sometimes fallen on deaf ears. None appear to be aware of the reasons for identifying her with Ovid's stepdaughter—indeed, they forget that he had a stepdaughter. It seems worth while, therefore, to bring back into notice the convincing but apparently forgotten disquisition⁴¹ of one of the Renaissance scholars, Constantius Fanensis, who died in 1490.

Constantius argued in brief that Ovid's words to Perilla (Tr. iii. 7, 18) *utque pater natae duxque comesque fui*, shows that she was not his daughter (some editors have been keen enough to see this!); that his (third) wife had a daughter of her own (Tr. V. 5, 19), and that Ovid would there say *nostra*, not *sua*, if the girl had been the daughter of both; and lastly that his step-

⁴⁰ Masson (p. 49) cites J. Lipsius' note on Tac. Ann. I. 2. Lipsius doubted whether she was related to Fabius or to Marcia; cf. also Némethy, Comment. ad Tristia, 1913, Excursus I. P. ii, 10, 10, mea . . . coniunx non aliena tibi, proves that she was related to Pompeius Macer with whom Ovid traveled in Asia and Sicily—probably through Macer's mother since his father or grandfather was Theophanes of Mytilene, a Greek; cf. Schanz, Röm. Litt., viii, ii, I, pp. 362-363.

⁴¹ Printed in Burmann's Appendix, pp. 5-7.

daughter married Suillius P. IV. 8, 11-12. These last lines are convincing, so far as concerns the point that Ovid had a step-daughter:

nam tibi quae coniunx, eadem mihi filia paene est,
et quae te generum, me vocat illa virum.⁴²

The only conclusion that can be drawn from these passages, says Constantius, is that Perilla, Ovid's stepdaughter—the daughter of his third wife—married Suillius.

In support of this conclusion we may add that, apart from members of the ruling family, Perilla is the only person at Rome whom Ovid addresses by name in the *Tristia*, since, as is well known, he did not wish anybody to incur possible danger by such open connection with an exile. He knew, however, that there was no danger to his wife and family. He does not name his wife, but the manner in which he addresses her leaves not the slightest doubt as to her identity.⁴³ It is much more probable, therefore, that Perilla was a member of Ovid's family than that she was merely a young friend whose poetic gift he had fostered. Everybody knew who she was just as everybody knew who his wife was, and so he could name her, whether Perilla is her real name or a pseudonym which he had been in the habit of applying to her. Sometime in the interval of about six years between the composition of Tr. iii. 7 and P. iv. 8 she married that accomplished but shifty politician, Suillius, so that in addressing him Ovid refers to the young wife as her who is 'almost my daughter' (P. iv. 8, 11).⁴⁴

ARTHUR L. WHEELER.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

⁴² Cf. v. 90, pro socero paene . . . tuo.

⁴³ Uxor, coniunx, carissima, etc. His failure to name her has been attributed to metrical reasons. It seems more probable that he found the terms uxor, etc., more effective.

⁴⁴ The phrase non patrio carmina more canis (Tr. iii. 7, 12) has been interpreted 'not in native fashion,' i. e. Greek verses, or 'not in your father's fashion,' i. e. non-erotic verses. The word *patrius* occurs commonly in Ovid in both senses: 'native' and 'father's'; cf. Burmann's *Index*. But since Ovid adds at once, in explanation of this line, nam tibi cum fatis mores natura pudicos . . . dedit, and since he urges Perilla not to fear his own punishment provided her verse does not teach love (vv. 27-30), he seems clearly, in vv. 11-12, to be expressing the hope that she is continuing her poetic efforts, but not in his own erotic manner.

THE DECIPHERMENT OF THE LYDIAN LANGUAGE.

The bilingual inscription (No. 1) found at Sardis has given us a starting-point for the decipherment of the Lydian texts, and Professors Thumb and Littmann have already made some progress in this direction. The first requisite, however, was a satisfactory translation of the Aramaic version of the text, which has evidently been the work of a Lydian rather than a Semite, and this has now been furnished by Dr. Cowley (*C. R. Acad.* 1921, 7 f.). Another requisite was a correct transcription of all the Lydian texts, now given in *Sardis VI*, part II (Leyden 1924). On the one hand, the characters are often difficult to determine, owing to mutilation, bad writing on the part of the engraver, and sometimes even to his confusion of two letters of similar form; on the other hand, there are certain letters the phonetic values of which had been fixed only conjecturally and, as is now clear, erroneously. These are the letters: $\ddot{\tau}$, \mathbb{W} , \uparrow , \mathfrak{z} , and \mathfrak{x} .

Following my suggestion in the decipherment of the Karian alphabet, the value of *h* was assigned to the first letter, $\ddot{\tau}$. But, as I pointed out in a note in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (1919, p. 204), it is the first letter of the word for "king," $\ddot{\tau}\text{-}\mathfrak{l}\text{-}m$, which we know from the Greek glosses was $\pi\acute{a}\lambda\mu\nu\text{-}s$. Consequently that first letter must have represented *p*. This is confirmed by the fact that it is the first letter of the name of the god Apollo, who is more than once coupled with Artemis, and whose name is written $\ddot{\tau}\text{-L-D-}\mathfrak{a}\text{-n-s}$ (23. 3),¹ as well as by the further fact that *p*, which we know from proper names to have existed in Lydian, is otherwise unrepresented in the script.

If $\ddot{\tau}$ is *p*, we must look elsewhere for the representative of the aspirate which the classical writers show was also known to the Lydians. This must be \uparrow , which can be written or omitted at pleasure before an initial vowel; e. g. *h-avlos* (12. 2) and *avlān* (2. 8); cp. *hitollad* (23. 8) and *hitalad* "image" (5. 4) with *antolan* (6. 3). Since \uparrow can stand between two consonants, as in *v-h-bapēnt* "they shall carry away," it must have resembled the Semitic *sh'wa*; for the sake of convenience, however, I repre-

¹ Cf. Danielsson, *Zu den lyd. Inschriften*, 1917, p. 25.

sent it by *h* rather than by ‘ or ’. A comparison of the two texts 43. 5 and 50. 4 shows that the same word is written indifferently *f-a-h-u-n-i-l* and *f-ē-n-h-a-l* (“he erected”). Cp. *fahniriz* and *favnēriz* (22. 1, 2).

As for **Ψ**, Mr. Arkwright long ago pointed out that it is the sonant *l*(?), since it represents the Greek *lambda* in the name of Alexander (3. 1) and at the same time is used vocalically. It also interchanges with non-vocalic *l*. The values of **ȝ** and **Ξ** have also been settled by Mr. Arkwright.² The former is employed in the Pergamon bilingual (40) to represent the syllable *-en-* in the name of Athena, *a-s-η-i-l*, and just as the suffix *-l* of the oblique case interchanges with *l*, so the suffix of the accusative is written sometimes *n* and sometimes *η*. That **Ξ** is a dental is clear from 4 b. 3, where it is used in the name of the god *s-a-n-d-a-s*, Sandes in Greek, Santas in Hittite. As it generally follows a nasal, and in *vāndas* (11. 2) seems to have become by assimilation the *vānnas*, *vanaś* “cave” of the later Sardian dialect, I transcribe it *d*, but its actual pronunciation probably approximated to *nd* or *nth*. In 22. 10 the god *Armda-k*, who is coupled with Bacchus, seems to be the Greek Hermes. If so, the form of the name must be explained as *armṇda(s)*, with the common Hittite suffix *-nda*, as in the name of the god Innarauwandas by the side of Innaras. This letter **Ξ** also apparently takes the place of *d*, since *dēn-vn̄* (13. 11) can hardly be dissociated from the pronominal *dēn-t* or *dās* from *dān*. On the other hand *niđin* (13. 11) may correspond to *ni-nin* (12. 5) rather than to *nid-in*.

One more letter, namely **¶**, remains to be determined. This is found once at Sardis, in the archaising inscription 11, and also occurs in the older Lydian text which I discovered at Gebel-es-Silsila, where for palaeographical reasons I gave it the value of *g*. That value is verified by 11. 4, where *a-t-r-g-o-l-l* is written *a-t-r-o-k-l* four lines further on.

The values of the other letters of the Lydian alphabet have been correctly fixed by Thumb and Littmann. The two sibilants were probably pronounced *s* and *sh*; I shall, however, transcribe them *z* and *s*. Similarly I shall continue to transcribe **¶** as *v*, though it was certainly pronounced like *w*. *V-n* must have

² *Sardis*, VI. 2, p. xii.

sounded something like the English *one*. A short *ü* represents a *shewa* between two consonants. Thus we have *nik-ü-mēk* “not here” for *nik-mēk* (24. 15), *vastn-ü-nliz* for *vastn-nliz* (10. 13); cp. Λαμβραννδευς or Λαβραννδευς for Λαβρανδευς. One word only begins with *r*, namely *raval* (50. 5) which is probably the engraver’s error for *baval*. Similarly in Hittite it is only borrowed foreign words that commence with *l*.

The value *f* assigned to **8** is merely a makeshift. In the name of Sardis it corresponds with Hebrew and Assyrian *p*, while in Greek it was assimilated to *w*, Ξάπις being stated to be the Lydian pronunciation of *Sardis*. In Lydian itself the word for “year” is written both *borl-l* and *forl-l*.

With the exception of the archaising **11**, the Sardian texts exhibit a dialect much affected by phonetic decay. Thus, as M. Cuny has pointed out, *Sfar-l* (22. 5) represents *Sfard-l*. So, too, the nominative *-s* is regularly dropped before the enclitic *-k*, and this is also frequently the case with the *l* and *n* of the oblique and accusative cases. *S* is similarly lost in *atrokł* by the side of *astrokol*.

In 22. 1, 2, *h* and *v* interchange in *fahñiri-z*, “a citizen” (?), and *favnñeri-z*, and I am inclined to think that this is sometimes also the case with the two suffixes *-hñ* and *-vñ*. That the accusative suffix *-n* could be dropped seems to be shown by *kov* for *kov-n* “gift” (10. 10). After *v* the vowel could be omitted, as in *vstas* (13. 2) by the side of *vastn-unliz* (10. 13), *vastn-unkms* (22. 7); so too *vratos* (13. 9), *vraul* (41. 4), *bētovliz* (43. 4).

THE NOUN. Compounds are common, and the adjective usually precedes the substantive. Suffixes are numerous and can be attached one to the other, retaining a semi-independent character. Thus the enclitic *-k* “and” can be inserted between the stem of a noun and its case-ending; e. g. *artimu-l-k-in* “and belonging (acc.) to Artemis” (24. 14), *vastnun-k-ms* “and the proprietor” (22. 7). Similarly we find *mitridaz-tal-s* “and of Mithridates” (24. 17).

Among the most common suffixes are *-d*, *-ad*, denoting possession and relationship; e. g. *ak-ad* “the property,” *eba-d* “her father,” *mla-tal-ad* “the descendant of Meles” (22. 3). On the Louvre seal *bakivali-d zamli-d* (51) means “property of Dion-

ysikles Saml-". So in 7.1, *ess vānas ez-k lapriza[d] ez-k pela-d*: "this cave and this labyrinth of niches and all this place." Cp. the Greek *Merm-na-d* (? for *m̄limnad*). The suffix *-ad*, *-ad* has a specially locative sense; e. g. *mida-d-a-d* "in the Midas quarter" or "tribe" (13.4), *dad* "this place" (24.4, 11.6). So also *Sfarvad* for *Sfarvad-d* "in Sardis" (11.1), *mru-d*, archaic *mru-vaa-d* (11.1) "the monument."

-Tal, which is probably a compound of *-t(a)* and *-l*, is the patronymic and is written *tl* at Silsilis. *-Zi* has a possessive force, and combined with *m* is topographic in signification as in *Ibsi-mzis* "Ephesian." *-Mz*, however, is plainly the *-mz*, *-ms*, *-miz* of the pronoun *ēn-m(i)z*, which would therefore be a compound of *-mi* and *-z(i)*. Cp. the Hittite *-mas*, *-man*.

-Mān denotes a place: e. g. *kud-mā(n)* "frontage" (13.1), *zer-ma-s* "tomb" (23.1), Greek *σαρπός*. From *zermas* is formed *zer-lis* "the entombed one" (24.3, 16): the word is spelt *zirmal* in 12.7, 23.3 and the simple form of it is found in *zer-s* (10.8).

-La and *-li* expressed relationship, *-li* more especially denoting ethnic relationship (as in Hittite); e. g. *iztamin-la-n* "(water) of the chapel" (13.7), *Hivna-li-z* "a Hivnian" (10.8), from *hivan*, *hivn* ("life," "age"?); *dum-liz* "slave" (10.3, 12.2), "domestic," "partner," (Greek *δοῦλος* as shown by Lambertz, *Glotta*, 1915) is from *dumiz* "house" (14.1). For the verbal use of the suffix *-li* see under the verb.

Another suffix was *-n*, and we find also *-dn*, *-hn*, and *-vn*, for which see the section on adverbs.

A common adjectival suffix is *-nd* as in other Asianic languages, while in *Mli-mna* we have a suffix *-mn* which seems to be patronymic. In Hittite it was ethnic, as it is in the Lydian *Ibsi-mṇan* (2.10). Cp. the Lydian *-mzi* above (in *Ibsi-mzis*).

The nominative singular of the noun terminated in *-s*, alternating with *-z*; the genitive and dative in *-l*, the accusative in *-n* and *n*. The suffix *l*, however, represented more than one earlier sound. As in Etruscan (and Hittite) a proper name or title could form its genitive in *-s* and *-z*; thus we have (22.1) *es-t mru-d Sfardēnd fahniri-z M̄limna-s*, "this is the monument of the Sardian citizen (?) Melimna"; cf. [fo]*hṇirān* . . . *Sfarda-k* in 27.3.

By the side of the nominative in -s we have traces of another and possibly older suffix in -l which tended to become -l.

The accusative plural terminated in -(a)n. So, also, apparently did the genitive plural; see 2.10: *Artimu-n Ibsi-mna-n Kulu-mna-(n)k zivralm-n* "priestess of the Artemises of Ephesus and Koloe." The plural *brvān* "years" (3.1, 43.1) corresponds with the genitive singular *borl-l* (41.1, 42.1). There was no separate plural suffix as in Etruscan.

THE PRONOUN. The genitive (and possibly also the nominative) of the first personal pronoun was *amu*, found also with the suffixes *amu-k* "of me" (13.2), *amu-k-it* (23.13), *amu-dān* (23.6, 24.4). With the first two the Hittite (*ammu*), *ammug*, are identical. For *dān* see infra.

In 13.2 *nāzi* appears to signify "of us" (Hittite *anze-l*).

In 10.8 *mēz* seems to be the possessive "mine" (*kadādā-mēz* "my client"?). -*Mit* as in *mru-mit* may be "it is my monument" as in Hittite; but *ni-mit* in 18.1 can hardly have anything to do with the first personal pronoun, and we have a suffix -(u)m in *ak-um* and other words.

Littmann has already observed that *bis*, *biz* is "he," *bilis* being the possessive "his." An older form of *bi* is *bu-*.

Nās, *nas*, may have been originally a demonstrative as in Hittite; but it is ordinarily used distributively. In 12.7, 13.3, we have the plural *nān*. Combined with the relative *pis*, *pid*, *nāmpis*, written *nāpis* and *nāpid*, signifies "whoever," "whatever." Along with *nān* we find also *nēn-n* as in *dētn-ēm̄n* "anything else" (24.20, etc.), *nēn* standing to *nān* as *dēn* to *dān*.

To *pid* and *nāmpid* we sometimes find -a affixed in a possessive sense; e. g. *pid-a* "what belongs to" (22.10), *nāpida* (22.5).

The most usual demonstrative is *ez*, *es*, nominative *ez-z* and *es-s*, oblique case *ez-l*, *ez-l*, accusative *esan*, *ezn*. The accusative plural is *ez-nān*. Combined with the pronominal suffixes it gives us *ez-l-it*, *ez-t*, *ez-tit*, etc. The Latin equivalent would be *hic*.

Another demonstrative, corresponding to the Latin *ille*, is *ēn* which we have in *ēnas*, *ēn-n*, *ēnān*, *ēnat*, *ēna-l-t*, *ēna-k*. Cp. the Hittite *enis*.

The Latin *iste* is represented by the combination of *ēn* with the suffix *-ms*; *ē-miz*, *ē-ml*, *ēmñ*, *ē-minañ*, from which we may conclude that *mis*, *ms* was primarily a demonstrative. The signification of *-ms* has already been pointed out by Littmann. It is the Hittite pronominal suffix *mas*, *man*, which is used in exactly the same way as *-ms*, *-ml* in Lydian.

An inscription (30) on a vase reads: (1) *Titis-in ē-mñ tisardñ fabil*. "Titis-it (viz.) this jar has made (for Atas Kitvas)." This must be the interpretation of the passage if the names *Atal* *Kitval* are in the oblique case, as usually in the Sardian texts. But it is possible that *Atal* is the nominative, the sonant *l* of the next word being a mistake of the scribe. If so, *-in* is the accusative (objective) suffix: "Atas K. has made this jar belonging to (i. e. for) Titis."

The relative is *pis* (*piz*) "who," *pid* "which," "what," with which the Hittite *kuis*, *kuid* appears to be identical. *Pis* and *pid* are also written *pes* (*pez*) (23. 2, 14) and *ped* (23. 14, 13. 12, 11. 6, 22. 14; see also *ped-k-ml* 24. 6, *ped-m* 10. 18).

Pela-d, *pela-k*, *pela-l*, *pel-l-k* signify "all" (1. 2, 24. 10, etc.).

Another pronoun which has a locative signification is *-das* (13. 6), *-dad* (11. 6, 24. 4); perhaps also *dāñ* (23. 6), *dā-k-um* (14. 8); cp. also *amu-dāñ* (23. 6, 24. 4). With the adverbial suffix the word appears as *dāñ* "during" (2. 2, etc.).

By the side of *da(s)* we find *dē(s)* like *nēn* by the side of *nān*; e. g. *dēn-vñ* (13. 11), *dēt* (22. 7, 23. 6, 16, 24. 22) "other," "(whatever) else."

By the side of *das* we have *din*; e. g. *kot-din* "he gave this place" (13. 4), *kud-din* "in front of this place" (13. 5), *fak-din* "the making of this place" (13. 7), *ni-din* "not here," "a non-place" (13. 11). Possibly *dēn* is allied.

ADVERBS AND CONJUNCTIONS. Adverbial and conjunctive words are numerous. *Ni* is "not," *ni-d* "not at all," "nothing," *ni-k* ("and not") "neither," "nor." The enclitic *-k* "and," "also," similarly gives us *pi-k* "where" (23. 20, 24. 8, 11), *fa-k* "then," *na-k* "thus," "namely," "both, and"; cp. *ēna-k* (10. 20).

Lē-k in the Silsilis inscription corresponds with the Greek ὥδε "here," and by the side of *mē-k* (23. 12, 24. 15) we have *lēñ* (12. 3, 10), *lēm-k* (13. 8) and *lēm-su-m* (14. 10).

Two important adverbial (or pronominal?) roots are *a* and *i*. Combined with the enclitic *-k*, *a* becomes *ak* "now," "thus," corresponding with the Hittite *nu* and *nu-ga(n)* at the beginning of a sentence; *i* in *in*, *int* and *ist* is equivalent to a substantive verb (see infra). *Fak*, the stem of the verb *fa* "to make," "do," is of different formation, though doubtless it was assimilated in use to the particle *ak*.

Bu-k is "either," "or." It is a compound of *-k* and *bu* "he," "it," as in *bu-l-k* "both him" (43. 5).

A common adverbial suffix is *-n*. Thus we have *tam-n* "within"; *eznay mlvēndan izkon pid-a tam-n*, "these two(?) coffins which are below" (2. 5, 6); *biz ē-tam-nu-na-dn*, "he who is buried below" (10. 18); *trod-n* "above (10. 5); *asfān* "at home," "on this side," "within" (22. 12, 13). *dān* "during," "namely." So *bidēn* "within" (?) (24. 6, 11). Cf. the adverbial use of accusatives like *χάριν* in Greek.

A fuller form of the suffix is *-vn*, as in *vh-bin-vn* "abroad," "on the other side" (22. 13), *hi-vn* and *hivan* "here" (10. 11, 23. 12), *dēn-vn*, etc. The latter suffix interchanges with the enclitic *-hn* "or," which we find, for example, in the common phrase *vissiz ni-vis-hn* "living or not living," literally, perhaps, "along with the not-living." Forms like *kat-vn-ēl* "inscribed" (22. 4), *vast-nu-nliz* "proprietor" (?) (10. 13), make it probable that the suffix has the same origin as the accusative. At all events the final *-n* can be attached in a semi-adverbial signification to other suffixes, e. g. *inān-id-n* (10. 19) "(his father) who (= -d) was resident (in Sardis)"; *hēn-zi-d-n* "in the cemetery" (13. 1), *famra-zi-d-n* "in the well(?)" (14. 9). Cf. *tisar-d-n* above.

The Hesychian gloss *ω πικ (κ)ρολεα* "(come) hither quickly" offers two examples of the suffix, *ω* implying an original Lydian *ivn* or *hivn*, while *κρολεα* would be *ka(?)role-n*. *πικ* is either *pik* or *pug(i)*. A prefix *ē* or *ēn* is found in *ē-tam-nu-nadn* above, as well as in other words: *ēn-tarflođ* "(This is a monument which his servant) has erected to Žaros son of Zivamos" (12. 1; in 14. 7 we have *zi-tarflos*); *ēn-zarbtot* (10. 4); *ēn-diblint* (27. 2); *ēn-vn-atol-k* (14. 9); *ē-tos-rs* (2. 3); *ē-tvers-n* (24. 14), etc. (*n* is always omitted before *t*). The prefix has nothing to do with the pronoun *ēn* and is probably adverbial.

THE VERB. The first person singular is found in the Silsilis inscription, where *pugi* corresponds with the usual "I have come" of the Greek graffiti. It is possible that *-gi* represents the flexion, but since *g* sometimes stands for an older *k* (see above), and *k*, as we shall see, is a verbal suffix, it is more probable that the vowel alone denoted the person. In the Hesychian gloss quoted above, the Greek *βάσκε* is given as the verb and may have been selected on account of its similarity in sound to a Lydian *pug-* or *puk-*. At all events in the Sardian texts the first person of the verb is simply a vowel: *fasfēn-u* "I possess" (23. 14), *kantor-u* "I bequeath" (23. 15).

The termination of the 3rd person singular of the present or future tense is *-d*; e. g. *fēnlibi-d* "he shall destroy" (or "injure"); *varbto-ki-d* "he shall expiate." The 3rd person plural ends in *-ēnt*; e. g. *vhabapēnt* "they shall scatter abroad," "deprive of."

The plural suffix, however, can also be used for the 3rd person singular; thus we find *fak-ml lefs vhabapēnt* "the doer shall the God punish" (3. 5). Also . . . *vhabu-pid* with *u* (2. 13); *āndēt* "says" (Mithridates), 24. 1.

The 3rd person singular of the aorist or perfect terminates in *-l*. Thus on the vase (30) we have *fabil* "he has made." Similarly in the Haussoullier inscription (50. 3) *fēnhal* = "he has erected" or "dedicated"; and elsewhere we have *fēna-nil* "he has erected" (15. 2). In 43. 5 *fahunil* takes the place of *fēnhal* in 50. 4: *davihil* (13. 7), *dahal* (10. 4), *fadifil* (24. 4), *fadil* (15. 1).

Another form of the 3rd person singular of the present and aorist ends in *-t*; as *fat* "he had made," *katul-fa-ki-t* "he has caused to be written," *fēnt-vintat* "it is tabu," *tatrot* (12. 9), etc. The final *t* of *ez-t* "this is," *ez-ti-t* "this is it," and the like seems to be the aoristic *-t*. So, too, must be the *-t* of the substantive verb *iz-t* (for which see the bilingual, 1. 5). Cp. the Hittite *Kî khantezi amel-tar-mi-t* "when it was my first manhood."

Besides *iz-t* we find the participle *izl* and *izl* which is employed absolutely in the bilingual: [or] *al izl-l Bakill-l* "the month being the Dionysiac" (1. 1). In the Silsilis text the word appears in its older form *izul* (unless, as is improbable, we should read *mretlizul*). A derivative from the verbal root *iz* is *iztan* (14. 7).

The adjectival suffix *-li* can also be used verbally, e. g. *es-s vānas Zivām-liz Armāv-liz*, "This cave belongs to Sivamos Arman" (6. 1-2); *es vānas Mane-liz Alu-liz*, "this cave belongs to Manes Alus" (4 a. 1). As in the other Asianic languages, the verb was not yet fully evolved and the gerundive or participle took the place of a finite tense. An instructive example is *zerli(s)-k zr-mli-t* (24. 16) which appears to mean "and the entombed (alone) has the tomb." So *amuk-it* "it is mine" (23. 14).

With the participial *-d* or *-od* I would associate a suffix *-red* which appears by the side of *-res*. In 3. 3-5 we read: *ak piz piz-red fakas zilavad fat nid ēnzlibid akm[l] lefs zarētas piz-it fēnzlibid ez-l vāna-l buk e[z-l] mru-l fak-ml lefs vhbapēnt*, "now who, whoever he be, does works of preservation(?) (and) destroys nothing, of him the God is a protector, but who injures this cave or this monument the doer will the god(s) carry away." So in 11. 1, 2: *ez-t mruvaad Zaristroz-l Sfaravad astrokol vāndas vihn are-l kada-red-k-ms*, "this is the monument of Saristros of the bodyguard at Sardis, from of old a family tomb; and he was a patrician" (Greek *κόδδαπος*). Again in 18. 1 *ez-vānan piz-red-n ni-mit fēnz[lib]*, "these caves whatever they are injure in no wise."

The passive is denoted by the suffix *-r(e)s*, as in *dahuve-rs-t* "it is dedicated" (23. 1); *akad Artimu(-l-)k bife-rs-t* "and is set apart as the property of Artemis" (23. 21). Cp. *ē-tvers-n* (24. 14), and *ē-tvers-k-in* (23. 10), also the name Lity-erses.

The participial *-nd*, *-nt* is similarly used in the sense of a finite verb like *zarētas* above. It corresponds with the Hittite *-nz(i)*, *-nz(a)*.

The imperative singular is represented by the verbal stem; e. g. *faov* "behold" (24. 2, 18) *sof* (18. 2). Perhaps *zaro-kak* is "let him incur" (23. 12). Verbal compounds are common, verbal roots being compounded with adverbial prefixes like *ēn-* and *fēnt-*, "away," "abroad," as well as with nouns and other verbs. Thus we have *katul-fakit* "he made a writing" (10. 7). *Fakit* itself is a compound of *fa* "to make," "do," and *ki* which I believe was originally an independent word, though it became a suffix of the perfect (like *turu-ke* "he gave" in Etruscan).

The same formative is common in Hittite, as in *akkus-kit* "he died," *sipanza-kir* "they offered," etc. Cp. also Greek δέδω-κε.

NUMERALS. In 22. 5, 10, we have *nā-pid-a Mlimns izt Sfar(d)-l II-tl*, "whatever belongs to the 2 Melimnas of Sardis," *pid-a II-tl Mlimns izt Sfar(d)-l*, "which belongs to the 2 Melimnas of Sardis."

STRUCTURE. Lydian agrees with the Hittite of Boghaz-Keui in the remarkable conglomeration of particles and pronominal forms at the commencement of a sentence. To the Hittite *nu* correspond the Lydian *ak* and *fak*, or rather *a* and *fa*, the final *k* being the *kan* and *gan* of Hittite. The pronominal forms are attached to the introductory particles just as they are in Hittite; *ak-it* "now it," *ak-it-in* "now it him," *ak-ms* "now he," *ak-ms-as* "now he them," *ak-ml* "now him," *ak-ml-ad* "now him the," *ak-ms-ad* "now he the," *ak-ml-it-in* "now him it him," etc. The dental *t* denotes a following 3rd person of the verb; the nasal, a following accusative or object; the dental *d*, relationship. We find something similar, though on a much reduced scale, in Etruscan; e. g. *Vel-ar-asi*; "Caius + plural + to."

TRANSLATIONS.

23. 1. ess zermas Pldān-l Artimu-l-k dahuv-ers-t
This tomb to Apollo and Artemis is dedicated,
2. vintad̄ ak-it ez-l zirma-l̄ pez fēnzlibid
set apart; now this tomb who injures
3. ni-vis-h̄ fak-ml̄-it-in Pldāns Tav-sas
or not-alive, the doer of it him Apollo, Zeus,
4. Artimu-k Ibzi-mziz kat-zarlo-kid brvās
and Artemis of Ephesus will curse. The year
5. V dān̄ āndēt Mitridaztas Mitra-tal-iz
5 it is. Says Mithradates of Mithras
6. kaves hitol-s buk afaris pl̄ dēt amu-dān̄
the priest: The image or chamber, all also there is, is
mine.
7. ak-m-añ brafrziz brafrl-l̄ zav-tarid fakud
Now descendant descendant(?) shall bury here(?)

8. amu-ovn akit pid fasfēnu akat pl fakantrov
beside(?) me. Now what I possess(?) (is) the prop-
erty wholly (of the said person).
9. (erasure) ak-ml-iz piz hitollad bitad
Now of it he who the images removes(?)
10. fak-ml-it-in Pl̄dān-k Artimu-k kat-zarlo-kid
the doer of it him both Apollo and Artemis will deprive
11. bi-l bil-l-k arlell-l pera-l ē-tverz-k-in
him and his family of water, and the anger (of the gods)
12. zarokak eznān hivan̄ nik-u-mēk
let him incur(?) . . . ; nor here
13. zavēnt nik biz nik biliz arlelliz
shall be buried neither he nor his family
14. ped-k amuk-it ped fasfēnu akat
And what is mine which I possess (is) the property
15. bavafu-l
of the heir.

NOTES.

1. Before the *s* (*sh*) of the nominative *ez* (*es*) becomes *es*. *Zermas* (*sermas*) is written *σερμός* by Hesychius, who explains it as *σωρός γῆς* or "tumulus." It was probably quoted from Hippoanax. That *Pl̄dān-s* is Apollo is clear from his association with Artemis: *ll* has been dentalised as in the Karian **Υσσωλδος* for **Υσσωλλος*. So in Boghaz-Keui Hittite the name of an early king is written indifferently *Labarna* and *Tabarna*.

The verb *dah(u)-* occurs again in 10. 4: *Voras dahal*, "V. has dedicated."

2. The engraver wrote by mistake the last syllable of *dahuv-*
erst. This was erased, but he forgot to replace it by the first
syllable of *fēnt-vintad* (written *fēt-vintat* 12. 4). The signifi-
cation is given by the context. The prefix *fēnt* must conse-
quently mean "apart," "away from" or the like. It is probable
that *fēn-t* and *fēn-z* (in *fēn-z-libid*) have the same origin.

3. Here again the engraver wrote the last syllable of the
previous word and omitted to supply *vissiz* after its erasure.
We find *tavṣēn* in 10. 12. Cp. *ταύρας* in Hesychius.

4. Note the loss of the nominatival *s* in *Artimu-k*. The general sense of the compound *kat-zarlo-kid* is clear. Perhaps *kat* is the verb *kato-* "to write."

Instead of the absolute nominative *brvās* "year" we elsewhere find *brvān* in the adverbial case (3. 1, 43. 1) and the oblique case *borl-l* (41. 1, 42. 1) and *forl-l* (50. 1). The last form explains the statement of Joh. Lydus that Sardis (Sfar-da) took its name from the Lydian word for "a year."

5. *Dān* evidently here retains its primitive meaning: "that (is)." The form *Mitra-tal-iz* is strikingly like similar forms in Etruscan.

6. Littmann has already pointed out that *kaves* is the word which appears as *kavev* in the Greek inscriptions of Sardis. It is the Kasko-Hittite *kuanis*, from which the Hebrew *kohen* was borrowed. Hesychius states that *kόνις* signified "priest" in the language of Samothrace.

Hitol-s is a variant form of *antolan*, the signification of which is fixed by 17. 2, where under the bas-relief come the words: *piz [ezna]n antolan fēnlib [id]*, "who destroys these figures." The variant spelling of the Lydian word, which is also written *anlolan* (4a. 2) and *hitalad* (5. 4), indicates a foreign origin; and I therefore believe that it has been borrowed from the Greek *εἰδωλον*.

The signification of *pl* is given by the bilingual text.

7. *Zav-tarid* is a compound of *zav* (*sav*) which occurs frequently in the inscriptions: *zav-n* (22. 8, 11. 3), *zavēnt* (below), *zavvas* (24. 21), *zavtaars* (14. 2), *zav-karblos* (12. 3). It is evidently the Karian *sava*, the *σοῦα* of Philip of Theangela which he stated was the Karian word for "tomb." Cp. Etruscan *su-thi*.

8. The termination *-vn* marks the use of *ovn* as an adverb or postposition.

The context here and in 24. 19 imposes the sense of either "possess" or "inherit" upon *fasfēnu* which must represent the first person of the verb. In 13. 7, 8 we have *iztaminlan piraal ēnat fasfēn-vn* "the water of the chapel which is the property of this place(?)", and in 14. 6 we find *fasp-n* which may belong to the same root.

9. *Bitad* recurs in 13. 6. In 24. 7 it seems to be written *bitaad*. Or is it connected with *bito-hn* 24. 5?

11. Littmann has already pointed out the meaning of this passage. *Arlell-l* is written *arlil-l* in 24. 13, and *arel* in the archaising inscription 11. 2 (*vandas vi-hn arel*, "it-was-the-cave of the family long since").

For the words that follow see note on the corresponding passage 24. 14, where we have *Artimu-l-k-in ētverz-n*, and *ezyan hivan* is omitted. Consequently *ētverz-n* would appear to represent an attribute of Artemis; cp. the name Lityenses ("the flute-player"?). *Hivan* I identify with the Hesychian *ω* (see above). Both *hivn* and *hivid* (for *hiva-red*) are found in 10. 10, 11.

With *amuk* cp. Hittite *ammug*. Here, as in *iz-t*, *es-t* ("this is"), *ez-li-t*, *ez-t-it*, the dental suffix which denotes the subject has a verbal force.

15. The context makes the signification of *bava-fu-l* fully certain. In 50. 5 we have *lefs-tl fadan baval* (the engraver has written *raval*, but Lydian words do not commence with *r*) which must mean something like "he has assigned (it) to the keeping of the god." *Bava-fu* is a compound; perhaps the second element is the same as that which we find in *fado-fidn* (10. 11).

24. 1. Āndēt Mitridaztas Mitra
Says Mithradates, of Mithra

2. kaves nak amu katoz-ɳ faov
the priest: now of me the writing behold!
3. ak-it nāpid zerliz zrml-it
Now it be in whatever way an entombed in the tomb
4. amu fadi-fil buk-ɳa-d amu-dān
to me does injury, either in this place by me
5. fa[k . . .]nal buk-ml-ad amu bitohn
constructed, or-the-of-it of me . . .
6. bid-ɳ ped-k-ml alad fētamnid-ɳ
within(?) and-what-of-it the . . . which are outside(?) ;
7. fak-ml-iz piz hitollad bitaad
the doer who the images removes(?)

8. buk-ml-iz fak-arz-ed pik buk-mla[d]
either he who does injury(?) or what (there)
9. fabuverftal buk-ml-it bazn-sa-k
has been constructed or . . .
10. nākid ni-visl-l̄ pel-l̄-k buk
. . . of the dead and every(thing) either
11. mētri-d buk bidēn pik in-t
without(?) or within(?) wherever it is;
12. fak-ml-it(?) A[r]timus Ibsi-msi-z
as to the doer, Artemis of Ephesus
13. kat-zarlo-kid b-l̄ bil-l̄-k arlil-l̄
will deprive him and his family
14. pira-l̄ Artimu-l̄-k-in ētverz-n
of water, and of Artemis the wrath(?)
15. zarokak; nik-u-mēk zavēnt nik
(let him incur?); nor here shall lie neither
16. biz nik bil zfēnis zerli-k zr-ml̄-it
he nor his offspring; and the entombed has the tomb.
17. āndēt nak amu Mitridaz-tal-s
He says that of me Mithradates
18. katoz-n faov akit amu nā-pid
the writings behold; there belongs to me whatever
19. fasfēnu nak aaran nak bira-k
I possess, namely court and house also
20. [n]ak dētn ēmn̄ akat amu mitridas . . .
and anything else, (it is) the property of me Mithradates,
21. [ka]ve-l̄ kantoru zavvastal
the priest; I leave (it) being buried.

Notes: 1. *Mitra kaves* without a suffix takes the place of *Mitra-tal-iz kaves* in 23. 5 f., being regarded as a compound.

2. *Nak* introduces a saying like "that" in English or *umma* in Assyrian.

The root *kato* is found in many words, *kato-valis* "scribe" (8. 5, 11. 7, 10. 1, 2), *kato-f-n* "inscription" (11. 11), *katañil*

"is written" (2.3), *kat-vn-ēl* which appears to be a different spelling of the same word (22.4), *katul-fa-kit* "he has caused to be written" (10.7). The signification is fixed by the passages 11.11 and 10.7. Perhaps *katoz-n* is a plural, "writings."

The context gives us the meaning of *faov*.

3. *Zelliz*, if so to be read, must be a variant spelling of *zerli(z)* in l. 16. It is met with elsewhere (10.3) and in 23.15 replaces the *zerli(s)* of l. 16. But the sense of the passage is obscure. Is *nāpid* a mistake for *nāpiz* "whatever person entombed in the tomb"? If the reading is correct, the meaning must be either "Now in whatever way one who is buried in my tomb shall injure" or "one who is buried in the tomb shall injure me."

4. The signification of *fadi-fil* is fixed by 5.5, "whoever injures (*fadint*) this cave." *Fado-fidn* (10.11) and *fadol* (3.2) may possibly belong to the same root.

In 11.6 we have *ped-k-dā-d hfsa-d* "and what in this place is . . .," and in 13.6 *nik-das*. *Dad* is the locative form of *das* for which see the section on Grammar. The signification of *dān* is given in the dating formula; whether *das* and *dān* are to be identified is doubtful.

5. *Buk-ml-ad* "or-the-of-it," i. e. "what belongs to it."

6. *Bidn*, also written *bidēn*, perhaps signifies "within"; "what belongs to it within my house" or "tomb." See line 11 and compare Hittite *bidi* "place," "interior."

7. *Fak-ml-iz* is literally "facientem + ille," with the suffix denoting the subject attached to the objective case governed by *kat-zarlo-kid* in line 13.

Bitaad appears to be the 3rd person of a verb.

8. This must be the general meaning of *fak-arz-ed*, but whether the *d* is the 3rd person of the verb or part of the second element of the compound I do not know. The final suffix is that which we find in -(r)*ed*, etc.

Pik from *pi(s)* must be the Hesychian *πικ*; see above. In 22.5, 10, we have *nā-pid-a Mlimns iz-t Sfar-l II-tl*, "whatever belongs to the 2 Sardian Melimnas," *pid-a II-tl Melimns iz-t Sfar-l*, "what belongs to the 2 Sardian Melimnas"; conse-

quently the suffix *-a* will denote connection with the following noun or nouns. It may be the pronominal *a* of *a-k*; cp. the Hittite suffix *-a* "also." Since *fabuver-st* is a passive form, the literal translation would therefore be: "there is construction of something."

9. *Buk-ml-it* "or-to-him-there-is," i. e. "or he has," "it has." In 13. 5 *fazivn* seems to denote some building outside the tomb.

11. For *bidēn* see note on line 6. If the word signifies "within," *mētrid* would be "outside" with locative suffix *-d*. *In-t* appears to imply that *iz-t* and *iz-l* represent *inz-t*, *inz-l*.

13. The meaning of *bl bill-k* has already been determined by Littmann.

14, 15. See notes on 23. 11, 12. *Artimu-l-k-in* agrees with *ētvers-n* and corresponds with what would be an adjectival form in the Indo-European languages.

The prefix *ēn* usually loses *n* before a dental. Can *-kak* be the termination of the 3rd person of the precative?

16. *Zfēnis* must have the same origin as *sfēndan* (2. 9, 42. 5), *sfēndav-ml-in* (2. 12). In 42. 5 the reading is: *bul-k bil-k sfēndan*, "both him and his family."

17. The combination of the two "genetival" suffixes *-tal* and *-s* should be noticed. Like *Artimu-l-k-in* above they are sufficient to exclude Lydian from the Indo-European family of speech. The change of *akad* with the possessive suffix into *akat* with the suffix of the subject should be noticed.

14. 1. *mru-mi-t Baal-Dumiz . . . fahtot*

This is my monument (which) Baal-Dumiz . . . has erected;

2. *astrkot-a-k zav-taars*

and was(?) strategos the buried one.

Notes: 1. I have identified the *mi-* of the first word with the pronominal *mi-* of *ē-mis* (see section on Grammar), but in view of the Hittite *AMEL-tar-mi-t*, "it was my manhood," the word ought, perhaps, rather to be explained as "it is my monument," with Baal-Dumiz as subject.

Lambertz has shown (*Glotta*, 1915) that the Greek δοῦλος "slave" is borrowed from Lydian and properly signified "a domestic." The word stands for δουμ-λος from δουμος, which in the Graeco-Lydian inscriptions corresponds with συμβίωσις, συνεργασία, "guild," "firm" (Ramsay: "*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*," p. 471). Δουμ-λος is written *dum-liz* in 12.2—*ez-t mru Zivāml-l Zaro-l ēn-tarflod dumliz . . .*; "This is the monument of Z. Z. which the servant of . . . has inscribed." In 22.2 we have *dum-ms*, and *dum-n-it* occurs in a broken line of the present inscription (14.14).

Baal-Dumiz is consequently "the House of Baal," a translation of the Semitic Beth-Baal or Beth-el, and the question therefore arises whether it is not a topographical name, the proper translation of the line being: "(This) is my monument, a Baal-temple which the servant (of the god) has erected": *fahtot* must mean either "erected" or "dedicated."

2. *Astroket* is the 3rd person singular of the verbal form of the word *astrokos*, also written *asturkos* (44.12) *astrk(os)*, *atrok(os)* and *atrg(os)* (11.4).

We learn from Hesychius that ἀστραλία(s) was the name given to the foreign mercenaries of the kings of Asia Minor who were generally Thracians in the later days of history. See *Sardis VI*, 2, pp. 67, 68. Under the name of Khabiri we read of them in the inscriptions of Rim-Sin, the contemporary of Khammurabi and Abraham, as constituting the royal bodyguard, and the force was introduced into Asia Minor by the Hittite monarchs. At Boghaz-Keui there were 1200 of them, and they were known there as the Khabirias. David formed a similar bodyguard of Philistine and Kretan mercenaries (2 Sam. viii. 18). Both in Asia Minor and in Babylonia, as well as in Palestine, in the age of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, they were also called the Sagasâ, written ideographically 'SA-GAZ, which means literally "murderers" or "executioners." The Lydian name is a compound of *astro-* and *ko-* ("to give"?") and perhaps signified originally "givers of service"; its resemblance to the Greek στρατηγός caused it to be identified with the latter word in Greek times and accordingly we find that the governing magistrates of the Lydian cities were termed *strategoi* though they were concerned, not with the military, but with the financial department (Ram-

say: "*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*," pp. 67 sqq.). Possibly a better translation would be: "the entombed is strategos."

13. 1. il-im Ānas Isas kud-mā-k hēnzi-d-ṇ alarms
The *ilim* of Onnes Isas and of what is in front of the cemetery (namely) the baetyl(?) ;
2. amuk nāzi-k ēmiz iztaminliz vstaas
of me and us this chapel (is) the property
3. datro-siz-k Zares nān izpazān-vṇ piraad
and the . . . Zares this channel(?) of the water
4. kot-din asfā-k hez-vṇ astrkot
has given; and on this side . . . he is strategos
Mida-ḍa-d
of the Midas-district.

Notes: 1. In 12. 6 we have *Isas il alarms desas*. Cp. *fak-mit el edz vastn-u-nliz* (10. 12-13). *Il(im)* may be the borrowed Semitic word. Onnes is the form assumed by the name in the Greek inscriptions; cp. Anna. The significance of *kud* is given by the bilingual. For the root *hēn* see 10. 8 *hēn-al* "he is dead," 10. 20 *hēnu* "I am dead," 22. 8 *hēn-tl Mlimnar* "the deceased Melimnas."

I can only conjecture the signification of *alarmas*, written *ararms* in 14. 11. We find the accusative *alarmn* 10. 17, and the nominative *alarms* 3. 2, 12. 6, as well as [a]lar-ml-ṇ 14. 5. But in 12. 2 *arar-ml* is followed by *havlos* which seems to be the same word as *avlān* (2. 8) where it denotes some part of a tomb. Hence *arar-ml* could mean "image," "baetyl," "memorial chapel" or something similar.

2. *Amuk* is the Hittite *ammug* or *ammuk*; *nāzi*, the Hittite *anze-l* "us."

Iztaminliz must be the Hittite *istaminas* "a chapel."

Vstaas appears to signify "property"; from it are derived the personal titles *vast-ṇ-un-k-ms* (22. 7) and *vast-ṇ-un-liz* (10. 13).

3. *Datro-s-is* is a personal title; see 22. 7, 11. 8. Analogy would lead to the inference that the word is of Greek origin, but I know no Greek word which would suit. With the termination cp. that of the proper name *Zaris-tros*. *Zares* is more

probably a title than a proper name. We have the participial *zarētas* (50. 7, 3. 4) *ak-m_l* *lefs zarētas*, "may the god favour him," *ak piz piz-red fakas zilavad fat nid [f]ēnzbibid ak-m[_l]* *lefs zarētas*, "and whoever does any work (hereafter?) without doing injury, him may the god favour." Hence *zares* may signify "friend" or "protector."

4. *Din* must be the demonstrative of locality; otherwise its most natural signification would seem to be: "to us."

The meaning of *asfān* is settled by 22. 12, 13, where it is opposed to *vhbin-vn* "on the other side," which is related to *vhba-pēnt* (1. 8), *vhbu-pid* (2. 13), etc., "remove," "take away."

10. 4. *vesfa-k Voras dahal*

And the inscription Voras has composed.

5. *ez-ti-t pid trod-n zēzvad piztorid-n kastān*
This is what (is) above

6. *mru-li-t trod-n fēllakin tam-n trfān*
of this monument, above the epitaph(?), below the
verses,

7. *fas katul-fa-kit mru-l-k ēnzarbtat*
making he caused to be written and the monument has
completed(?)

In large letters:

8. *ak hēnal Nārs Plzers Hivnalis kaddad-mēs*
Now is dead N. P. Hivnalis my friend(?).

9. *fak-mi-t ēnud izt katoval-l zadmē-l*
My deed this is, the writer of the stele,

10. *fak-ms-aq amu kov hiva-rd kot*
doer-he-it to me the gift here(?) gives

17. *kud nak*
. in front namely

18. *ēnas amās ped-m biz ē-tamn-unad-n*
of this . . . along with(?) what he placed below

19. ak eba-d inān-id-ṇ Sfarvad
and his father who inhabited(?) Sardis;

20. ak hēnu . . .
but I am dead . . .

4. A comparison of *nid paazl-l vesfas* (12.2) and *fasp-ṇ ni-paazla-d* (14.6) seems to show that *vesfān* and *fasp(a)n* are variant spellings of the same word; cp. the verb *fasfēnu* "I possess" (24.19).

Dahal has the same root as *dahuvers-t* "has been consecrated" (23.1). Perhaps a better rendering of the line would be: "V. has dedicated the composition."

5. That *tam-ṇ* means "below" is clear from 2.6. "Those sarcophagi (or bodies) that are below" (*pid-a tam-ṇ*); consequently *trod-ṇ* must be "above."

In 10.17 we have *alarm-n kastal-hṇ* where *kastal* appears to represent *καστωλοί* the name given to the "Dorians" by the Lydians. *καστωλοί* would equal *kastav-l*.

6. In 12.1 the compound *ēn-tarflod* signifies "he has inscribed" or something similar, and in 14.7 we find *mrzlas zitarflos*. Perhaps we should read *zav-tarblos* in 12.3, "sepulchral inscription(?)".

7. The sense of the root *kato-*, *katu-* is fixed by 11.11: *piz fak-orfid katofn buk mruvaal*, "who injures the writing or monument."

8. *Nārs Plzers* seem to be two epithets rather than proper names. *Hiv-ṇ-al-is* is a denominative from *hiv-ṇ*, "the Hivian." The name is evidently a derivative from *hivan*, *hivṇ*.

Kaddad is allied to *kaddirs* (22.3, 9, 11), which is evidently the Greek *κόδδαροι*. In the life of Apollonius of Tyana we are told that the citizens of Sardis were divided into the two classes of *ξυριστ-ταυροί* and *κόδδαροι*. *ξυριστ-* is *Ξυριστ*, which according to Xanthus Lydus was the correct spelling of the name of Sardis, *ταυροί* being from the Lydian *ταυρά* "city," as in *Μασ-ταυρά* (which Stephanus Byz. states meant "the city of Ma"). *Κόδδαροι* will be, accordingly, those who were not original citizens or patricians; they represented the "clients" of Rome, and we may regard their name as signifying originally "the com-

panions" or "allies" of the earlier citizens. Hence in 22.3, 9, 11, Melimna is called a "kaddirs" or "adopted citizen." We find the same title in *kadar-ed-k-ms* "and he was an adopted citizen" (11.2); *kaddiv-n kotit* (22.6) is possibly "he acquired citizenship." Cp. the Karian, Cilician and "Pelasgian" Attic name *Kόδρος*.

10. *Hiva-r-d* appears to be literally "when-he-was-here"; *kov* is for *kov-n* like *vesfa* for *vesfā-n* above.

18. The significance of the suffix *-m* escapes me. In 14.8 we have *da-k-um est*, and in the present set of verses *ak-um nā-pid kol* (line 12) and *isp-k-um* (line 15).

Perhaps the last word of this line should be translated "who is below."

19. In *inān-id-η* the final nasal is the adverbial suffix; the determinative *-id* agrees with the *-d* of *eba-d*. I do not see what other signification can be assigned to the word than that which I have given it. On the other hand in 22.15 *ak ped alidad tasod ak-ml-ad inānt* may possibly be: "and what she left the children they shall inherit it."

It may be remarked that the metre of the verses of which Voras claims to be the author appears to be accentual rather than quantitative.

It is clear from the preceding facts that (1) Lydian is allied to the Hittite of Boghaz Keui. The two languages agree so remarkably in structure, grammar and vocabulary as to show that they must either stand in the relationship of two sister-languages or that Lydian is a dialect or daughter of Hittite. Against the latter supposition may be urged the absence in Lydian of the Hittite adverbs *arkha*, *para*, *anda(n)* and *sara* (*ser*) which play such an important part in the sentence. Perhaps, however, this is balanced by the extraordinary preponderance of an initial guttural in both languages. Boghaz-Keui Hittite, however, is a mixed language containing large Indo-European and Assyrian elements; with these Lydian has nothing to do. Whether there is any relationship between Lydian and Karian beyond the borrowing of a few words cannot be decided at present owing to the scanty nature of our Karian materials; according to Herodotus (I. 171) Lydus and Kar were brothers.

Philip of Theangela (fr. 2) stated that more Greek words had been borrowed by Karian than by any other language of Asia Minor, and in one of the fragments of Xanthus (fr. 8) we are told that Mysian was a mixture of Lydian and Phrygian.

On the other hand (2) there is no genetic relationship between Lydian and Etruscan, which to me is a very unexpected fact. Apart from forms like *Mitra-taliz*, the only resemblances that can be pointed out are the verbal formative *k(i)*, the suffixed conjunction *-k* and one or two words like *su-thi* "tomb" (Lyd. *zav*) and *hin-thi* "ghost" (Lyd. *hēn* "to die"). But these may be merely coincidences. We know that in Lydia itself two different languages were spoken, Lydian and Maeonian, and if the Etruscans were descended from the Torrhebian tribe there may have been three. Lydus and Tyrsenus were brothers only, and the name of Lydus does not appear to antedate the dynasty of the Herakleidae. In the frontier city of Kibyra there were four different languages in the time of Strabo; Lydian, Solymian, Pisidian and Greek, and on the Obelisk of Xanthos as well as in an inscription of Antiphellus (No. 55) a language differing from the normal is represented by the side of the Lycian.

So, too, among the Karian inscriptions is one which I have concluded to be in the Kaunian dialect (*Tr. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, IX. 1, 1887), and an inscription I copied at Gebel es-Silsila represents still another variety of Karian speech (*Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, May, 1905). The bilingual inscription of Bartaras discovered by the Germans at Pergamon is presumably in Mysian, which in that case will have been a Lydian dialect. In their main grammatical features, as well as in certain words like the Kaskian *kuanis* "priest," *ki* or *ku* "to give," Lydian and Hittite resemble Kaskian and Vannic. Sandas was a deity common to the Lydians and Cilicians; he is especially prominent in the Boghaz Keui texts called Luvian by Dr. Forrer, Luvian being a sister dialect spoken in Cilicia.

To the Lydian glosses collected by Mr. Buckler (*Sardis*, VI, 2, pp. 85-8) a few more may be added, if we remember that according to Herodotus (I. 171) the Lydians and Karians were brothers and spoke the same language.

μέρμης = *τρίορχος* Hesych. In a recently-discovered papyrus

(Grenfell and Hunt: *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XV, p. 158) Μερμαδαι is quoted from Andron as signifying τρίορχοι in Lydian. Cp. the Trojan and Italic name Capys = "falcon" in Etruscan (Serv. *ad Aen.* X. 145).

Τανσας as a proper name occurs in a Karian inscription (B. C. H. iv. 296). τανσ = μέγας, πολύς; τανσας = μεγαλύνας, πλεονάσας; Hesych.

Βασα(ν)ικόρος = ὁ θᾶσσον συνονομάζων παρὰ Ἱππώνακτι Hesych.; κόρος = "priest."

κέραμος = δεσμωτήριον καὶ ὄχυρωμα καὶ πόλις Καρίας; Hesych.

Μασανης, Μασνης (= Μάνης the Lydian Sun-god) on coins (Head: *Hist. Numm.*, p. 657; Radet: *La Lydie*, pp. 83-4; Wilamowitz: *Hermes* 34, p. 222).

Τύλος "son of the earth" (Dion. Hal., I. 27) on coins (see Head and Radet, *l. c.*).

σαμνίς = ἡ πρόπολις ὑπὸ τῶν μελισσουργῶν; Hesych. Not "bee-keepers"; cf. the "bee" priests and priestesses at Ephesus; also σίμβλος.

κάπηλος which has no Indo-European etymology seems to have been a Lydian word; see Herodotus I. 94. Cp. Lat. *caupo* (borrowed from Etruscan?).

Two Lydian months are mentioned in the inscriptions, *Huwe-lis* and *Baki-lis*. The latter corresponds to the Greek "Dionysian." As the name is not borrowed or adapted from the Greek Dionysos, we may infer that Bakis (Bakkhos) was a native word which (like τύραννος) came to the Greeks from Asia Minor. This is confirmed by the various significations assigned to it by Hesychius—"priest of Dionysos," "(vine-)branch" or "lamp" used in the mysteries, and "fish," as well as by the variant form of the name itself, Iakkhos (for Wiyakkhos, with assimilation to ιάχω). *Huwe-lis* implies a deity *Huwe(s)*. Υῆς is defined by Hesych. as Ζεὺς ὄμβριος, "god of rain," and Υεύς is stated to be the Phrygian (Dionysos) Sabazios. The month accordingly would have been "the rainy" month, while Bakillis was the month of the vintage. With *Huwe(s)*, cp. the name of the Mysian water-deity Hy-las, as well as that of the Lydian river Hy-llos, variously said to be the son of Omphalē and of the Earth-goddess (Kybelē).

A. H. SAYCE.

SCANDINAVIAN PHILOLOGY

SURVEY OF THE STUDY; RELATION TO OTHER SCIENCES; MAJOR PROBLEMS OF THE PRESENT.¹

Students of philology in the Scandinavian North have concerned themselves with the same general problems as in other European countries, although the emphasis has not been quite the same. Some scholars have occupied themselves with those languages and literatures that lie outside the Indo-European family, but by far the greater part of the work there, as in western European universities in general, has been in the Indo-European field. General linguistics has received a good deal of attention; I shall merely mention the work of Otto Jespersen in Copenhagen. Within the non-Indo-European field, it was natural that Scandinavian scholars should be drawn somewhat to the Finno-Ugrian family, since some of the chief representatives of that family are immediate neighbors to the north and the east. Otherwise, ancient Egyptian and Semitic have not been neglected, nor the languages of the lower races, as the Esquimaux and the American Indians, where, however, the main interest has been in the cultural side of the study (religion, folk-lore, etc.). Within the Indo-European field Celtic and Slavonic philology have claimed the attention of many students; in the former I may note especially the investigations of Carl Marstrander in Norway at the present time. But it is in the Indo-Iranian, the Classical, and the Germanic field that the larger number have worked.

It would be presumptuous of me to try to tell you here of the extent of their contributions in these subjects. But I shall speak briefly of the place that, within the Germanic field, Scandinavian philology has always held in the North. Extensive as have been the researches that have been carried on there in Classical, French, English, and German philology, it may be emphasized at once that it is Old Norse and the Scandi-

¹ Paper read before Section L2, Philological Sciences, American Association for the Advancement of Science, at the Cincinnati Meeting, January 1, 1924.

navian languages that have always been the central interest, the work around which all the rest have been grouped, so to speak. Long before there was such a thing as a science of Germanic philology, long before any scholar ever dreamed of the original unity of the languages which, since Rask and Bopp, we call the Indo-European, and consequently also long before the science of Comparative Philology came into existence, Scandinavian scholars had been engaged in editing and interpreting the ancient literary monuments of the North. There had been a great deal of interest in the Classical languages and in those of western Europe before Rask showed their kinship with Old Norse in his *Undersöelse* in 1814. Indeed, Johan Ihre in Sweden had in the *Prooemium* of his *Glossarium Svio-Gothicum*, showed the kinship of Latin, Greek, and German, to Old Norse as early as 1769. This wider interest antedates considerably, therefore, the discovery of Sanscrit and the appearance of Franz Bopp's *Über das Conjugationssystem der Sanskritsprache* in 1816. And so when the structural kinship of all these languages was discovered, a discovery that inaugurated a new era for the study of language in general, it was only natural that this new extension of interest should attach itself more or less definitely to the work that had already been done in Old Norse language and literature.

If Comparative, Classical, Germanic, and Scandinavian philology have always occupied a prominent place in teaching and research in the North; if Scandinavian scholars have contributed their fair share to the advance of these sciences from the beginning; and if, at the present time, these studies continue to hold the attention and to engage the efforts of many leading investigators in the North, I think, perhaps, this close connection there of all philological work with the philological study of the native language has been a factor of no small importance. I am even inclined to think that the neglect of the native language is liable to be attended with harmful results. Without a scientific interest in the native language we shall hardly be able to foster that kind of attitude that is required for the establishing of a science of philology in any field. But the development of such a philological interest, and such a scientific attitude to philology, is dependent in a measure, without doubt, upon the existence of a native literature of such importance in respect of content and form,—that is in range of subject, scope of the literature,

and a developed literary language, and extent over a sufficient period of time, as to be capable of reflecting the various sides of the cultural history of a people. And if this literature extends back into the beginnings of the history of that nation, connecting that age with the present, we shall have a condition that approaches somewhat the ideal.

In the broadest connotation of the term, philology is the study of the cultural history of peoples. But in practice the word philology is used more specifically of the study of the cultural history of peoples as reflected in the literary monuments of their past. The chief task of the philologist is, then, the interpretation of these monuments as to their linguistic form and as to their content, thus including both historical grammar and the history of the literature. On the linguistic side of his work the philologist may often have to, or perhaps by preference will, engage in studies of monuments that have no literary importance, materials that antedate the beginnings of literature in the language studied, as when he investigates and interprets linguistically or culturally the runic inscriptions, ancient magic formulas, or the place-names of a country. On the literary side of his work the philologist's special field of interest may lead him into those lines which are prominently represented in the literature studied; and so have arisen within philology those departments of study we call mythology and folk-lore. So have arisen also, as in part the outgrowth of philological research, such sciences as comparative religion and the history of culture. Well-known though these things are to us all, I speak of them here, nevertheless, because this contact of interest and scientific activity is so excellently exemplified in the history of philology in the North.

The North was favorably circumstanced in a peculiar degree in the fact that it had an extensive and varied early literature, linking, from the dawn of its history, the past with the present in unbroken development. To be sure, this literature is in considerable measure the possession of Iceland in the first place, and Norway only in the second place, as having the smaller share; and Denmark and Sweden, too, claim but a small part in it. Whatever more there may have been of literature of this kind in the pre-classical period in Norway, and elsewhere in the North, was destroyed in connection with the wars between

paganism and Christianity, just as evidences of pagan worship were destroyed in England and Germany and elsewhere. Consequently, Denmark and Sweden have little or no literature of pre-Christian content; they enter the historical period in a time of great literary decline. But the languages of the North were, in the classical period of Old Norse, so similar in their form, that these monuments might be studied by Danes and Swedes quite as if they were their own. Furthermore, some of the poetic literature goes back in point of time to the period before the separation of the ancient language of the North into the three languages, Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish, from the second of which Icelandic later arose.

I may be permitted, perhaps, merely to remind you of the nature of that literature in the first period, which we usually date 800-1100. There are the religious magic formulas and parts of poems which lead us into the field of early cults, comparative religion, and primitive medicine; there are the mythical lays, supplemented by other material of like content of later date, which led students into the investigation of myths and religious beliefs, studies out of which, by Scandinavian, German, Dutch, and English scholars, grew the science of Germanic Mythology, founded by Jakob Grimm; there are the heroic lays, which take us into the domain of Germanic saga; and there are the primitive lays and groups of other lays, which throw light on the question of the beginnings of literature, and on that of types of literary forms among early Germanic peoples. Then there is the poetry of the court poets or scalds (there were 209 in all, between 850-1250), which, aside from the interest that attaches to its metrical form, has philological and historical value of very great importance. In the second period, 1100-1300, this early poetry was put to writing; and it continued to be cultivated among the people. Actual studies of its form and interpretation of its content were begun; and there were new additions of poetic materials of similar kind, and of other kinds.

But the most significant development in this second period is the rise of the Icelandic sagas. This incomparable native prose enjoyed its golden age in the seventy-five years, 1150-1225. The sagas deal with native Norse material, and are written in a language genuinely national, absolutely uninfluenced by foreign models, in masterly prose, and with remarkable narrative skill.

The study of the saga style is the natural point of departure for the study of prose style in the North. But its significance is even greater than that. This saga prose was created at a time when there was practically no prose in England or Germany; and in these countries the earliest literary prose is not uninfluenced by foreign forms; and hence, perhaps, it is not a true and adequate instrument of literary expression for these nations at that time. The sagas represent the earliest developed national Germanic prose. If it be to some passages of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* that we must go for a study of the very beginnings of English and Germanic prose, crude and inadequate often, but exceedingly fascinating to observe because it is the beginnings, then it is in the family sagas and the kings' sagas of Snorre that native Germanic prose first attains that classical quality that gives it a place by the side of the best prose anywhere. I shall not stop to speak of the extent of this saga literature of a somewhat later time, within the Old Norse period. Nor can I more than mention the fact that the intellectual interests of the period included also law, history, geography, and natural science, and somewhat later foreign literatures, resulting in numerous translations. I shall add that these interests included also grammatical studies; of these the so-called *First Grammatical Treatise* is of real importance.

The following period, the XIV-XVth centuries, is one of extensive copying and collecting of manuscripts. But for the interest evidenced in this activity in different parts of the North, especially on the part of Icelanders, but also on the part of Danes and Swedes, much of the ancient literature would have been lost to us. Of course, the principal collections of manuscripts associated with the names of Brynjolfur Sveinsson, 1605-1675, and Arne Magnusson, b. 1663, belong to the XVIIth century, as you know; similarly the gathering of the de la Gardie collection in Upsala University, as well as the Rugmann-Eggertson collection in the Royal Library at Stockholm (end of the XVIIIth c.). The great Arnamagnéan Collection of mainly Old Norse manuscripts preserved in the University Library at Copenhagen contains now a little more than 2,500 numbers. We may say, indeed, that the possession of this priceless body of manuscripts has made Copenhagen a central seat of Old Norse study. Arne Magnusson died in 1730; and he left his vast

library to the University. It is interesting to read some of the provisions of the bequest. The purpose of the gift was to be 'to explain, improve, and have printed, everything that concerns the history of the northern countries, namely Denmark and Norway, and lands under them, their languages and antiquities, by which earlier periods in the North, as to geography, laws, customs, life, arts and sciences, coins, monuments, and all else of similar kind, is to be understood.' There were to be two fellowships attached to the foundation; the duties of the fellows were to be to prepare editions for publication, and these were to be 'printed well, on white paper,' we are told, 'and with new, clean, and neat types.' The affairs of the Foundation are directed by The Arnamagnæan Commission, established in 1772.

Learned interest in the languages and literatures of the North begins early in the XVIth century, but I shall have to pass this over. I shall mention, however, the considerable editorial activity that was developed from ca. 1665 to 1825. This was so extensive, and much of the output was of such significance, that it will be no exaggeration to say that a science of Scandinavian Philology was an actuality in the two closing decades of the XVIIIth century. Since 1825 there have been in existence a number of Text Societies, devoted to publishing the material in the different collections. The best of it was long ago made available, in various kinds of editions, and again in recent up-to-date editions; some has been published in English, Dutch, and French editions, much more in German editions; some is being published every year; some remains unpublished.

It will be in order to hurry on to the question of the most recent developments of philology in the North, and I shall here too confine myself almost entirely to those in Scandinavian philology; but I shall indicate also, here and there, the connection with the wider field.

The publicational activities of societies and the universities have, of course, continued. The study of the language and the literature, the history, the mythology, or the history of the culture of peoples, requires critical apparatus of a far higher order at the present time than ever before. In satisfying these modern needs the founding of the *Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Literatur* in 1879 inaugurated a new epoch in the North. Its most significant publications have been the photo-

typic diplomatic edition of the *Codex Regius* of the *Elder Edda*, 1891, and the critical edition of the *Heimskringla* (1893-1901). This society seeks, by studies of all available variants of a MS., to publish the restored original text, an effort at restitution that often obliges the editor to operate with a great body of texts and fragments of texts. Such is also the plan of the Norwegian *Kildeskriftfond* series, in which the saga collection called *Eirspennil* was issued in 1916, and the *Sverre's Saga* in 1922. In other series and publications by other institutions exact reprints of important manuscripts are aimed at, with the abbreviations resolved and set in italics. Such is the method of the three parts of the *Palæografisk Atlas*, 1903, 1905, and 1907; this is also the plan of the *American Facsimile Edition* of the *Speculum Regale*, 1916, supplied also with a phototypic edition, page for page. A combination of both methods is adopted in the great edition of Scaldic poetry published by the Arnamagnæan Commission in 1912, the received text in Vol. I, and the restored text in Vol. II. The Norwegian Government has completed the vast series of the *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, number XVIII, a volume of 1467 pages, being issued in 1913. The series of Swedish charters continues, with volume VI in 1921; the Old Swedish text society (*Svenska Fornskriftsällskapet*) continues with volume 146 in 1915. The issues in 1911-12 in this series, namely the writings of Joh. Th. Bureus, will be of interest to linguists.

In this work of furnishing the needed apparatus German scholars have co-operated efficiently; I shall mention especially the *Altnordische Sagabibliothek*, of which the XVth volume appeared in 1921. In Germany particularly (among non-Scandinavian countries) the necessary tools have not been lacking; the co-operation of German scholars has been extensive now for 70 years, and especially since the establishment of the first Old Norse professorate in Kiel in 1865 (held by Th. Möbius). Of other countries, Holland, Austria, and England are to be especially mentioned. The work of the *Viking Society (Society for Northern Research)*, London) must also be mentioned; I shall instance especially its series of excellent translations of the Icelandic sagas. Among Austrian contributions there is the stately edition of the *Sæmundar Edda*, by F. Detter and R. Heinzel, Vienna, 1903. In Holland R. C. Boer has re-

cently given us a splendid and attractively gotten-up two-volume edition of the *Die Edda* (1922). Here in America we have been laboring against very great odds, far away from the manuscript collections, and handicapped for want of materials of other kinds, which it takes a long time to build up in any one place. But there are also many needs over there; the linguistic investigator requires different kinds of editions from those that the historian or the literary student needs, or that he needs who would use the texts for studies in mythology or related lines. Diplomatic editions of a large number of important manuscripts and all the earliest fragments are a primary desideratum; further, photographic editions of the earliest Old Scandinavian material; unpublished texts should at once be published in critical editions; and finally, as far as England and America are concerned, up-to-date helps to suit the particular requirements are needed.

I shall have to omit the study of the history of the literature. I shall also have to pass over the extensive work in textual criticism that has preceded our present knowledge of the texts, with the bearing of this in both literary and linguistic direction. Nor would it be very profitable to try to give you at this time any idea of the numerous and complex problems that are claiming attention at the present time in the vast field of Norse mythology, a field which is, on the one hand, intimately connected with the two above-mentioned subjects, and on the other hand, with the whole field of Indo-European religion and the science of mythology in general. I shall, however, below touch incidentally upon a couple of these problems in connection with other parts of the field of Scandinavian philology. Also I shall have to omit entirely investigations in Scandinavian palaeography, a study that has been of special interest to me. Regarding the work on the runic inscriptions I shall say that the issuing of the series of inscriptions associated with the name of Sophus Bugge in Norway and with those of S. Söderberg and E. Brate in Sweden continues. Of Wimmer's great edition of *De danske Runemindesmærker*, completed in 1908, a handbook edition was published in 1917. With regard to the question of the form of the runic letters I may add that it seems to me that Otto von Friesen, Upsala, has established that the *form* of the runes goes back mainly to Greek, only in slight part to

Latin letters; whether a single rune is descended from primitive Germanic symbols is very problematical. As to the time and place of origin of the runes there can be little doubt that it was on the west and northwest coast of the Black Sea, where Greek and Goth first came in contact in the second half of the IIInd c. A. D. Then I shall finally add that the problem of the *names* of the runes, and their use outside the domain of script, takes us more and more into the field of magic names in primitive Germanic and Indo-European times. Runic inscriptions are still occasionally being discovered in the North; one day a few years ago, when I spent part of a summer in Upsala University, Professor von Friesen took me out to show me a newly-unearthed rune-stone. It lay near a wall in a back-yard in the heart of Upsala.

We may now most conveniently turn to the subject of lexicography. I shall here select two recent works for a few words of special mention. In 1919 Alf Torp's *Nynorsk etymologisk Ordbok* was published; the MS. lay ready as far as the letter *u* at the time of Torp's death, and the work was completed by M. Hægsted, and H. Falk. Additional materials, under the letters *a-s*, which were left by the author have been deposited in the University Library. Torp's name is known to most of you I assume through his researches in Pali, Etruscan, and other parts of the IE. field. He is less known to you as a scholar of equal distinction in the field of Old Norse, Norse-Danish lexicography, and Norwegian dialects. Torp's dictionary is an unusual thing in that it is practically limited to the dialects; but for these it is especially full. Thus it is the first etymological dialect dictionary of any language, so far as I know. It is this that gives it its great value; for it is of the dialects that we need the fullest possible information at the present time. And here we have an authoritative etymological presentation of the present state of knowledge about the dialects of one of the Germanic countries. Torp's dictionary is an indispensable tool in the library of every Germanist; possibly it is also indispensable to every student of Indo-European linguistics. The second work that I shall mention is J. Jakobsen's *Ordbog over det norræne Sprog på Shetland*, which was completed in 1918. The Old Norse language, in strangely distorted form often, was spoken still by a few aged individuals in the Shetlands as late as ca.

1800 (by one person as late as 1850). Jakobsen, a native of the Faroes, spent the years 1892-1895 in Shetland gathering together all the remnants of the ancient tongue that he could find. He made a collection of some 10,000 words, including quite a body of taboo-words. I shall confine my brief account to the last class. Here Jakobsen uncovered materials that are invaluable for word-study and semasiology, on the one hand, and for primitive belief, on the other. We have seen from elsewhere before, as the South Sea Islands, what rôle taboo plays in primitive social institutions and customs. Here we see it as an important factor in the history of words in an Indo-European community. I became acquainted with Jakobsen while I was a student in Copenhagen University twenty-five years ago. He was then a young man, modest, quiet; but I recall that he showed considerable satisfaction in pointing out and explaining these taboo-words, as he presented me with a copy of the volume. And the importance of this line of investigation can hardly be overestimated. The word *taboo*, of New Zealand origin, means there 'much marked'; it is used by the Polynesians to designate something as holy, as consecrated to, or as standing in a peculiarly close relation to, the Higher Powers; and hence it is forbidden among men. Names of the deities may be taboo, and modifications of them, or circumlocutions, are invented; the king, the priest, certain animals, are taboo. And so elsewhere. In Tahiti in the reign of Pomares the syllable *po-* was taboo, and during his reign this syllable was banished from all words in the language, and replaced by modifications and substitutions. Similar is the evidence from many parts of the IE. world, though I know of no case quite like the last. The English word 'thunder,' OE. *thunor*, German *Donner*, Norse *Tora*, and *Thor*, is not used in Sweden; the once existing *tordön* was a taboo-word, and this was replaced by *qs-aka*, the corresponding substituted *noa*-term. To take a modern example, the dangerous land-point called 'The Cape of Storms' ceased early to be used, and the *noa*-name 'The Cape of Good Hope' took its place. How large may not the number of words in the IE. languages be that have their origin in connection with such belief? Especially do these facts seem to bear on the question of the large number of words, as words for animals or things, for which there are cognates only in two or three members of the IE. family. How did

the words in the other languages, words which semantically correspond to them, but are formally irregular, originate? And what was the original meaning of many of these? What is their relation to yet other words of the same or nearly the same meaning, or perhaps of utterly different meaning but identical form? May not many strange irregularities find their explanation right here? Under lexicography I shall in this connection call attention to the completion of Aug. Lyttkens *Svenska Växtnamn*, 1904-1916, in three volumes, a dictionary of native names for plants and flowers, arranged throughout under the botanical name; the presentation is comparative Germanic. And I shall finally mention E. Hellquist's *Svensk etymologisk Ordbok*, an etymological dictionary of the language which includes also the place-names of the country. I believe this is the first time that this important element of the word-stock of a language has been incorporated in an etymological dictionary.

And this takes us to that branch of philology that deals with the names of places. Linguistically place-names are that body of the words or word-elements of a language that enter into the composition of names; these elements may still exist in living speech perhaps, or they may have disappeared long ago, and never been recorded in literature. It is a long time since place-names first began to attract interest among writers in various European countries; but it is only recently that the possibilities of this department of investigation have been revealed. When I say this, however, I should not leave unmentioned a very early effort at place-name classification, namely that of Andreas Stobaeus, in his *De Scania Antiqua*, Lund, Sweden, 1706, which is significant, coming so early. The systematic presentation of the place-names of a country began, I should say, with P. A. Munch's *Historisk-topografisk Beskrivelse af Kongeriget Norge*, published at Moss, Norway, in 1849. Then in 1870 the present scientific research in this field may be said to have begun with K. Rygh's treatise on the names of Helgeland, northern Norway, published in *Norsk Historisk Tidsskrift*, 1870, pp. 53-135. I take it that all informed students of place-names today agree that this was the fundamental study. In it the methodology that has since been followed was first formulated in its main aspects. The preparatory work on the extensive corpus of Norwegian place-names was begun in 1878; the first

volume of this was issued in 1897, O. Rygh's *Norske Gaardnavne*. With the issue of 1919 the series numbers XVII volumes; Finmarken still remains, and on this work is now progressing. In Denmark and Sweden, series like that in Norway are now in process of publication. Since 1913 there has been in existence in the North a journal devoted exclusively to the study of names: *Namn och Bygd, Tidskrift för nordisk Ortnamnsforskning*, edited and published by J. Sahlgren, Lund. Just at the present time no department of the field of Scandinavian philology and cultural history is engaging the attention of so many workers as this; a list of the publications on Scandinavian place-names for the year 1918 alone (which is the issue I have before me) numbers 110 titles.

And what have been the contributions of these investigators? I shall speak of one or two of them. To some the interest is purely linguistic, specifically Scandinavian; but in part also it has a broader bearing. It has been shown that the short-type names are, as a class, the most ancient. It is held by some students that a great many of these and certain groups of the double-theme names are of Stone-Age origin; others would date the oldest names of both classes in the Bronze Age. For at least a group of ten names, an antiquity of 4,000 years seems strongly probable (*Vor Oldtid*, 1914, pp. 115-130); these were names given by late Stone-Age settlers to places that had, before these settlements were made, been temporarily occupied by another people or earlier groups of the same race, who were still living in a semi-nomadic state. To me it seems that the main part of the earliest names cannot, as yet at any rate, be dated back of the Bronze Age. But in this case also they would antedate or be contemporary with the origin of the parent Germanic language. And they would be considerably older than the closing phases of the Germanic sound-shift. That is, they belong to the IE. period of Germanic linguistic area. It has been shown that river names, lake names, and island names, in Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, are often very ancient. As a topographical class the river names are, no doubt, the earliest of names; often other names are but derivatives from them. E. Hellquist published in 1903-1906 a work of very great importance entitled *Svenska Sjönamn*; I shall pick out one point from his study. His work deals, as the title shows, primarily with the names of

Swedish lakes; it is shown that there is sometimes ablaut relation between the names of lakes and the names of rivers flowing from them. But ablaut has not been a living principle in Germanic since primitive IE. times, except in the verb. Thus the conclusion forces itself upon us that these lake and river names are survivals in southern Sweden from IE. times, and are to be dated back into the early Bronze Age. Or putting it differently, the people who gave these names to these rivers and lakes spoke Indo-European; and also, we are dealing with a region that forms a part of the common home of the Indo-Europeans. How much more of the surrounding territory belongs to that area, that is another question. I want to add that I do not regard the facts here reviewed as proving that southern Sweden formed a part of the *original* home of the Indo-Europeans. Present knowledge of the subject is obliged to include a rather large area as the common home of a people that developed our IE. culture, of which IE. speech is a part. We know some regions that must have been a part of that common home, before the great migrations south and east began; but it is not possible at present to delimit that area to a region where that culture took its beginnings.

This is one phase of the study of place-names; I shall turn to another. Many of the short-type names in the North, and some of the themes of the long-type names, have never been explained; they are meaningless to us today if we judge them on the basis of known present or past Scandinavian words and forms. Sometimes Gothic or other Germanic cognates help us out, and we learn that the particular word, not recorded in Old Scandinavian and supposedly non-existent there, actually did exist there, and was such a living element that it could be used in the naming of places. However, sometimes Germanic does not help us out, but some other IE. language may; especially, perhaps, some name of a river, a lake, or other body of water, within the ancient area. May we not suppose that a considerable body of new linguistic material will be uncovered in this way in the oldest nature-names, (and other names) in the various countries inhabited by Indo-Europeans, when collections like the Norwegian-Swedish ones mentioned lie ready at hand for the whole area?

I have spoken in the foregoing about the linguistic and

historical aspects of place-name study. Let me cite one more example. Here we have new light thrown upon the age and the geographical area of Germanic-Finno-Ugrian contact in prehistoric times. The date of that contact is now, possibly, to be pushed back to about 1500 B. C., as the beginning. Here a series of publications by T. E. Karsten of Helsingfors University occupy an especially prominent place; last his *Germanisch-Finnische Lehnwortstudien*, Helsingfors, 1915, and *Fragen aus dem Gebiete der germanisch-finnischen Berührungen*, 1922. It is well known that the study of this subject takes its beginning with Vilhelm Thomsen's *Den gotiske Sproglæsses Indflydelse paa den finske*, in 1869 (German translation, 1870). Of very great importance was, thereafter, J. K. Qvigstad's *Nordische Lehnwörter im Lappischen*, Christiania, 1893. Among recent contributors I shall mention K. B. Wiklund and Hugo Pipping in Helsingfors, the latter last in his *Finländska Ortnamn*, 1918. Thomsen and after him others held that Gothic was the immediate source of the Germanic element in Finnish, and he dated it as beginning about at the commencement of our era. His school further held that the Finns had not reached their present home before 700 A. D., which then is the earliest date of Scandinavian contact with them. But recent researches have made it strongly probable that southwestern Finland was occupied by Indo-Europeans in early Bronze-Age times, and that these Indo-Europeans were geographically a part of the Scandinavian branch. And the Finns had arrived to the east and the south of them already in the late Stone Age, and soon after came in contact with Scandinavians in this northeastern corner of the then IE. home. It seems clear that a number of the ancient Scandinavian words found in Finno-Ugrian go back to this IE. period, that is, they antedate the Germanic sound-shift.

Thus philology and archæology meet as auxiliary sciences on the borderland of place-names; and questions of linguistics or history are solved that could never be settled except by the co-operation of the two. Sometimes researches in place-names give information of far-reaching bearing in other directions. Some years ago the Norwegian Government offered a prize for the most important contribution during the year upon the subject of Norwegian history. The winner of the prize was Professor

Magnus Olsen in Christiania University, and the subject he investigated was The Evidence of Pagan Cults in Norwegian Place-Names (*Hedenske Kultminder i norske Stednavne*), something that he had been engaged upon for many years. Olsen shows the age of various cults, and he defines the areas of worship; we learn whether the worship was that of holy places in the open, or worship in temples; we see that several gods were worshipped in particular regions, gods whose names are not even known in Germanic or Norse mythology; in some cases it is clear that they are forerunners of later high divinities. It is an epoch-making investigation which opens up entirely new fields. Here we are still wholly within the domain of Scandinavian philology in the study of cults and myths. If, for a moment, we allow ourselves to pass over the borderland between philology and archæology, and into the latter entirely, in our search for the origins of cults and gods, we seem to be justified in several additional conclusions, of which I shall mention only one: namely, that the origin of personal gods in the North probably goes back to about 1200-1500 B. C.

Finally the philological contribution to the study of early Scandinavian society should not remain unmentioned; and here it is a recent French work that I shall confine my mention to. It is a recent work on the subject, and it is in every way a most significant contribution. I refer to Maurice Cahen's *Études sur le vocabulaire religieux du vieux-Scandinave*, and especially the study on *La libation*, Paris, 1921, in which the vocabulary of libation is interpreted in detail in connection with the social customs themselves. In this type of investigation one is not interested in the etymology of a word; one cares nothing about its origin. One wishes first to determine the earliest ascertainable use of the word in the language studied; then that becomes the point of departure for the investigation. But one is interested here primarily in the customs, the institutions, and the ideas connected with these; and this will in the course of the investigation draw in a large number of other words, perhaps, as one traces the development from antiquity to the present. M. Cahen has spent several years of study in the North, especially Norway; he is thoroughly familiar with the whole field of Scandinavian philology; his own special interest is Old Norse. And his work is at present a valuable aid in giving new

impulse to Scandinavian studies in France. Of course some of you are familiar with that very significant series of investigations by H. Falk in a closely-related field, published by the Christiania Scientific Society under the titles: *Altnordisches Seewesen*, 1912, *Altnordische Waffenkunde*, 1914, and *Altnordische Kleiderkunde*, 1921.

Time does not permit me to speak at all of recent advance in the study of Historical Scandinavian Grammar, which, of course, is a major department of interest. Here the numerous publications of Adolf Noreen and Axel Kock in Sweden have been nothing less than epoch-making. In the more limited field of West Norwegian the extensive investigations of Marius Hægstad in Norway have been of fundamental importance. Neither can I deal here with the Scandinavian approach to such questions as theories of mixed languages, or the problem of language change, or that perennial riddle of the origin of language (perhaps we should rather say, the origin of languages). Regarding the study of dialects in the North I shall merely say that, as in Germany, Holland, England, and France, the emphasis has been largely upon the study of the vocabulary, the phonology and the forms. It is felt now to be unfortunate that the work has been almost entirely limited to these phases. There is a tendency to shift the study somewhat to syntax and to such matters as stress, musical accent, and sentence rhythm. Much, I am sure, may be expected from investigations in these directions. I should like to say, however, that also within the parts of the field before studied, one subject has been rather neglected, namely that of word-formation. Studies in dialect word-formation would be welcome and are actually needed at the present time.

Conclusion. It is apparent that philology has occupied a prominent place in the educational scheme in the North, and in the training of those who go into the humanities and the historical sciences. And I think it may be said that philology maintains this place, without any loss of influence in any of its domains, even though, as a matter of fact, there are more students now than formerly in certain newer lines that have come forward. I think it may fairly be said that philology, in its various divisions, occupies the dominant place in education in the North. If it was so in the days of Worsaae, Keiser, Munch, G. Storm,

and the two Ryghs, without mentioning any who were primarily philologists, it is still so in the day of Stjärna, Steenstrup, Sars, A. Bugge, Koht, and Sahlgren. These and many others, then and now, though not philologists, had philological training, often a good deal of it; and in their work, as the need arose, they applied philological method to philological problems. For example, O. Rygh, the general editor of the monumental work on Norwegian place-names, was not a philologist; he was an archæologist. Of course, when problems in language came up, about which he felt that he could not pass final judgment, the associated members of the Committee (a lexicographer and an Old Norse specialist) were consulted. You ask: why was an archæologist appointed to the editorship of this work? Well, it was recognized there, even at that time, that the study of place-names is almost as much of an archæological matter as a philological one; and it was apparently easier to find an archæologist with the required philological training than a philologist with archæological training.

A second thing which even our brief survey of Scandinavian philology suggests is the effective way in which the work is correlated with other fields. It is readily seen how philology and archæology are mutually dependent upon each other in the realm of place-names, inscriptions, magic symbols, and rock-sculptures. And philology, on the one hand, and ethnology and anthropology, on the other, may often have to rely upon each other's findings for the key to the solution of the problem at hand. But history and philology are in the same way mutually supporting sciences, not only in the internal history of the nation, but they may, in equal measure, be so in the history of a people's relationship to other peoples; as in the history that is reflected in the loan-words of a people, and in the words and names which it in turn has contributed to neighboring languages. Further fields of cooperation are in the dialects, in the folk-lore, and in the work in local history carried on by the numerous provincial or county historical, cultural-historical, or antiquarian societies, etc. Or again, between literature and philology in numerous ways; for here, surely, the points of contact are more intimate than anywhere else, and the possibilities of correlation greater. And finally, there is the contact with psychology in the realm of linguistics, in the study of semantics, and such subjects

as linguistic change, and the origins of language. These two disciplines have often dealt with the same problems in the past; where the two domains touch, it is certain that neither can find the true solution of these problems except with the cooperation of the other. It was of course this spirit of cooperation and coordination and the recognition of the interdependence of the sciences, and of philology and the other humanities, that prompted the Scientific Society of Norway in March, 1919, to appoint a Committee to formulate plans for the establishing of a Fund for the Study of Comparative History and Culture, which is to include not only the Scandinavian languages, but all others as well; and we read in the second paragraph of the announcement: 'thus returning to science something of the profits which the war has brought us.' According to the Committee's plan there are to be three departments: 1, Ethnological Jurisprudence; 2, Comparative Religion; 3, Popular Traditions (the term used was *Folkeminneforskning*, which is really a broader term).

A third feature which suggests itself in our survey is the emphasis upon minute research. This I assume does not differ in any material way, however, from the emphasis upon it elsewhere, unless it be in the Scandinavian school of folk-lore, where the outstanding names are Moltke Moe (d. 1913) and Axel Olrik (d. 1919). But I cannot go into that here.

Then finally there is a fourth feature, which I think is not without importance, namely the keeping of the public in touch with scientific advance. It is recognized that it is not only right and proper from the standpoint of the public, but also desirable from the standpoint of science that there should be this bond of understanding between the layman and the investigator, whatever be his domain. The public should know what the scientist is doing; but if the public is to know, if the public is to get the right ideas about it, the facts—that is, the contents and the aims of science—must be presented to the public by those who know, that is, by the scientists themselves. This they succeed in doing in various ways over there. There are first of all the general popularized presentations of the various branches of science, each written by a specialist, himself an investigator, but written without too much technical terminology. Splendid things in this way are appearing constantly in the North; I

shall name here N. Beckman's *Språkets Liv*, 1918, in Sweden, and on the subject of civilization in general that masterly popular presentation entitled *Kulturens Historie*, 3 vols., by K. Visted, Christiania, 1917. These works, as well as the excellent translations of classics of Old Norse and of other languages, as recently Homer's *Odyssey* by A. Garborg, are put out by the chief publishing houses, are well printed, attractively bound, and sold at very reasonable prices. Then there are the literary and scientific reviews of the daily papers, and the magazines, well written and correct as to the facts; and further, the accounts of scientific undertakings, of the meetings of learned societies, etc. It was especially interesting to me to see, on the occasion of the annual meeting of the Scandinavian Historical-Philological Association in the summer of 1912, what remarkably scientifically correct, and interesting, accounts appeared in the Scandinavian papers. In this country more attention to this phase of the work would be a good thing; especially perhaps has it been neglected in philology, here in America. It is high time that the philologist recognize that he must be his own interpreter with the public; if the aims and the ideals of the department of science that he represents are to be rightly understood.

In the above survey I have confined myself almost entirely to the work in the Scandinavian North; and even here I could speak of only those movements and notable works which seemed best to illustrate the development of the science and the present tendencies of research. I have, therefore, been able to take into account neither the extensive and invaluable contributions of Germany to Scandinavian philology, nor the important, though less extensive, contributions of other European countries, or of our own American workers in this field.

The science of philology may be said to have entered upon a new phase in the last few years. Investigations of far-reaching importance give a clearer emphasis than ever before to the contact of linguistic science with cultural and historical research. There is the same emphasis as before, to be sure, upon the fundamental importance of minute grammatical research, or of minute research in all the departments of philology. But there is a new emphasis upon other aspects, especially upon the relation of philology to several other sciences, namely those sciences

that have to do with the study of the development of humanity. And in this study language, perhaps, is our principal tool and source of information. It is especially in the countries of northern, central and western Europe that these ideas and this extension of scholarly interest and activity have taken shape. Here in America the contacts of philology with these sciences are, to be sure, not always quite the same as in these European countries. But in the main the problems and the aims are the same; and the methods are the same. It is this same European region which became the cradle of Indo-European philology and linguistic science; and it is here that philology, in all its departments, has always been most intensively cultivated. By comparison the scientific contributions of America have, except in limited parts of the field, been rather small up to this time. But here too there are signs of a new growth of interest. We may confidently hope, I am sure, that America will in the future share in an important way in this development, and in the general work of philological science.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

HORACE'S DESCRIPTION OF A SCENE IN LUCILIUS.

In the first part of the tenth Satire Horace, as Hendrickson¹ has shown, devotes himself chiefly to countering Valerius Cato's estimates of Lucilius. Horace's concession in l. 64

fuerit Lucilius, inquam,
comis et urbanus,

implies that Cato claimed geniality and wit for Lucilius though he denied it to Horace. This characterization is here repeated from a similar argument with an *adversarius* left unnamed in Sat. IV, 90:

Hic tibi comis et urbanus liberque videtur.

Now, the trend of the argument in Sat. IV gains much in lucidity if the opponent, "tibi," be recognized as Cato and if the subject, "hic," be Lucilius as in the tenth Satire. And the exact repetition of *comis et urbanus* was perhaps meant to facilitate that recognition. If the person discussed in IV 90 is Lucilius, then of course it follows that the banqueting scene which Horace describes in the preceding four lines (IV, 86-89) belongs to Lucilius:

Saepe tribus lectis videas cenare quaternos,
E quibus unus avet quavis aspergere cunctos
Praeter eum qui praebet aquam; post hunc quoque potus,
Condita cum verax aperit praecordia Liber.

Lucilius, we know, described a sordid banquet in his fifth book, an overlavish one in bk. XX, and there are signs of other dining-room scenes in III and in unplaced fragments. Horace, to be sure, begins with *saepe* as though generalizing, but he presently becomes explicit enough to indicate that he has a definite scene in mind.

Let us go back to the setting of these lines, and identifying Cato and Horace as the speakers, note the trend of the argument (ll. 78 ff.):

Cato: Your wit consists in reviling, you are merely a base slanderer.

¹ Class. Phil., 1916, p. 249.

Horace: You could not say that if you knew me (l. 80). He² who criticizes an absent friend or fails to defend him, he who is witty at the expense of another's good name, he is a slanderer, my dear super-Roman (85). You have seen cheap dinners where guests are crowded, where one backbites his fellow-guests, and finally, when intoxicated, even the host (90). Such a man you call "genial and witty" and candid, you who take offense at "slanderers." You think I malign because I smile at a fop, but you do not hesitate to damn your own friends by innuendo.

The point in the specific word *Romane* (l. 85) as applied to Cato is the same as in the phrase *Equitum doctissimus* in X 8a. It is a reference to Cato's claims to higher birth than general rumor accorded him. Suetonius³ (Roth p. 262) gives the clue to both epithets: "Some say that Cato was a freedman of Bursenus of Gaul. Cato himself, in his brochure entitled *Indignatio*, says he was born free, but having been left in the care of a guardian he had for that reason been the more easily robbed of his patrimony during the lawless times of Sulla." In other words "Romane" in IV refers to his claim that he was born *ingenuus* while *equitum* in X refers to his insistence that he had once had a *patrimonium*.

We have, therefore, in the repetition of *comis et urbanus* a suggestion that Lucilius is the subject discussed in both places, and in the sarcastic "Romane" and "*equitum doctissimus*" a hint that the *adversarius* in both instances is Valerius Cato. As a consequence we seem to be justified in restoring to Lucilius, Bk. V or XX, a crowded banqueting scene of the type ridiculed by Horace, and also in assuming that Lucilius, in describing the banquet, wrote it in the first person as one who had been one of the guests. Horace in writing a similar satire (II. 8) naturally avoids committing the tasteless error he here criticizes. He assigns the rôle of narrator to Fundanius.

² I follow Heinze rather than Lejay in assigning the lines 91-5 to Horace, not to his *adversarius*. Lejay places them in quotes on the ground that *nigris* of l. 90 is an answer to *niger* in 85. But I take both as an answer to *pravus* in 79.

³ P. Valerius Cato, ut nonnulli tradiderunt, Burseni cuiusdam liber-tus ex Gallia; ipse libello, cui est titulus *Indignatio*, ingenum se natum ait et pupillum relictum, eoque facilius licentia Sullani temporis exutum patrimonio. There seems to be no evidence by which to decide whether the adverse rumors were true.

Since I cannot point to any fragment in Lucilius to substantiate this interpretation, complete proof is of course wanting, but the fourth Satire calls for some such explanation as I have offered. We know that Valerius Cato not only reissued Lucilius with an editor's enthusiasm for his subject, but that he was also at the forefront of the hostile reviewers who greeted Horace's new satires with charges of imitation, and lack of geniality and wit. But the battle covered more ground than merely the worth of Horace's satires as compared with those of Lucilius. Horace, as every one saw, journeyed in the train of Apollodorus,⁴ Quintilius Varus and Varius, the new classicists who had the ear of the powerful men that controlled literary patronage, whereas Cato's neoteric and anti-Caesarian group had dwindled to a few forlorn stragglers like Furius, Ticidas,⁵ and the cantores of a passing generation. In both IV and X Horace begins with a defense of himself against an unfair comparison with Lucilius, but before one has read many lines, one realizes that in both satires a larger issue is at stake.⁶

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

⁴ See Heliodorus-Apollodorus Sat. I. V, in Class. Phil. 1920, p. 393.

⁵ See Ticidas the Neoteric Poet, Class. Rev. 1920, p. 91.

⁶ It is clear that political animosity had a part in creating antagonism between the neoteric and the new Augustan circle. In the early period the "new poets" had been hostile to Julius Caesar and friendly to the senate as I have shown in an essay on "Cicero and the Poetae Novi" (A. J. P. 1919, 396-415). Some of them, notably Catullus, Calvus and Memmius, were silenced by Caesar before the Civil War, but their published works still contained the bitter lampoons which the Augustan circle found so difficult to forgive. Horace's fling at the Collegium Poetarum and its chief critic, Tarpa, in Sat. X. 38, should be connected with the fact that Pompey had chosen Tarpa to select and stage the official plays during his consulship. Apparently Pompey had been a patron of the Collegium which Horace scorns. We also remember that Cornificius, one of the neoteric poets, died in defence of the republican cause, and that Cinna, perhaps not wholly by mistake as Plutarch thought, was killed by the mob near Caesar's bier. Of the men criticized in Sat. X, Pitholaus the Rhodian had written a eulogy of Pompey and lampooned Caesar; Fannius had sent his portrait to the poet's club; Furius Bibaculus, who seems to be referred to in line 36, had ridiculed Augustus as well as Caesar; Valerius Cato—*qui solus legit et facit poetas*—seems to have had a high position in the Collegium Poetarum, and Lucilius, the chief theme of the satire, was of course a favorite of Pompey's circle because of his close kinship.

ON TACITUS, AGRICOLA, 44, 5.

Writing of the death of Agricola, Tacitus has: "festinatae mortis grande solacium tulit evasisse postremum illud tempus," etc.

Here the editors disagree as to the precise meaning. Some of them make 'evasisse' the subject of 'tulit'; others make 'evasisse' the object of 'tulit,' and call 'solacium' an attributive accusative, or an accusative in apposition. One or two make the 'evasisse' clause explanatory of 'solacium,' which is probably right. Cp. Ovid, Met. 5, 191,

magna feres tacitas solacia mortis ad umbras,
a tanto cecidisse viro;

Lucan, 8, 314-16,

sat magna feram solacia mortis
orbe iacens alio, nihil haec in membra cruenta,
nil sacerum fecisse pie;

Statius, Silv. 2, 5, 24-27,

magna tamen subiti tecum solacia leti,
victa, feres, quod te maesti populusque patresque,
ceu notus caderes tristi gladiator harena,
ingemuere mori.

In view of the poetic tone of so much of Tacitus' treatise, one need hardly hesitate to offer these parallels in verse. And if they are admitted, they may suggest that Agricola not only 'won,' or 'gained,' a great consolation, but actually 'took it with him' (to some other sphere).

W. P. MUSTARD.

REPORTS

GLOTTA. ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR GRIECHISCHE UND LATEINISCHE SPRACHE. Herausgegeben von PAUL KRETSCHMER und WILHELM KROLL. XIII. Band. 1923-4.

Pp. 1-11, 189-205. P. Fischer, Zur Stellung des Verbums im Griechischen. Statistical study. Results support Delbrück against Kieckers. Normal position of verb at end. Disturbance of normal order usually indicates emphasis on some element found out of position; thus subject may be emphasized by postponement, verb by advancement.

Pp. 11-16. A. Nehring, Zum Namen der Quitte. Argues that Greek name of the quince came from Asia Minor, with the fruit itself. The evidence is scattered but cumulatively strong.

Pp. 16-32, 214-222. F. Stürmer, Wortkunde im griechischen Unterricht der oberen Klassen. The author believes that elementary notions of linguistic science should be taught in the study of Greek and Latin in secondary schools; even "auf der Unterstufe" etymology should be used "in ausgiebigem Masse." This will arouse the interest and help the memory of the pupils. He illustrates with extensive lists of examples, dealing with the elements of historical phonology, Ablaut, analogy, assimilation and dissimilation, haplogy; morphology, especially suffixation; and semantics (much attention paid to classification of changes in meaning of words, and the underlying principles which determine such changes). Illustrations of like phenomena in the pupils' native language should be extensively used on all occasions.

Pp. 32-42. O. Immisch, Crimen. The word meant primarily "Wehruf, Notruf" (of person attacked), and is derived from *queror*; **querimen* became **quirimen* under the influence of *quiritare*, and thence *crimen*.

Pp. 42-64. Drexler, Plautinische Beobachtungen zum lateinischen Akzent. Study of sentence-accent, with its bearing on meter. Latin accent of the time of Plautus was "expiratory" and might vary according to position of the word in the phrase. "Es ist also einfach unrichtig, dass sich Silbenquantität und expiratorischer Akzent ausschliessen müssen, wie man bisher gemeinlich glaubte."

Pp. 65-74. Th. Grienberger, Italica. 1. Der Stein von Anzi. 2. Die Statuette von Osimo. Interpretation of two inscriptions (Oscan and Umbrian), now lost, from Mommsen, *Die unterital. Dialekte* (1850), 191 and 359-362, Tables 12 and 16.

Pp. 74-76. R. Rau, Plautus Bacchides 929 (*ibus* = *iis*). For *non pedibus*, read *nempe ibus* (*ibus* for *iis*).

Pp. 76-78. R. Rau, *sic-ut* oder *si-cut?* Connects *ut* with stem *quo-*, and regards *-cut* in *sicut* as related; = Gk. πότε.

Pp. 79-98. H. Zimmermann, Das ursprüngliche Geschlecht von *dies*. Supports the thesis of Wolterstorff (Glotta 12, 112 ff.) that *dies* was originally fem., but on wholly different and independent grounds; mainly on Vedic evidence. Vedic *dyau-* is regularly fem. except when personified as a god (even personified, it is sometimes a goddess). This personification is to Z. clearly secondary, tho appearing also in Greek and Latin (*Zeós*, *Diespiter*). He derives the word from root *div-* "schleudern, strahlen, schiessen," and regards its original meaning as "Aufflammen der Sonne bei Tagesanbruch."

Pp. 98-101. P. Wahrmann, Homer. ἐν νυκτὶς ἀμολγῷ. ἀμολγός = ἀκμή; the "middle of the night" is meant, originally as the "richness, fullness, high point" of the night; ἀμολγός "udder," from ἀμέλγω.

Pp. 101-114. P. Kretschmer, Dyaus, *Zeós*, Diespiter und die Abstrakta im Indogermanischen. Replying to Zimmermann (above, 79 ff.), objects particularly to his assumption that the personification of Dyaus is to be naturally assumed as late (and so also the masc. gender of the word, which Z. supposes depends thereon). Such personifications are very ancient, and may (as Grimm believed) lie at the root of grammatical gender as a whole. K. believes the masculine *dyaus* is certainly "uralt," and is very doubtful whether the Vedic and Latin evidence proves the same for the fem.

Pp. 114-115. P. Kretschmer, Lat. *amo*. An Etruscan loan-word: Etr. *Aminθ*, god of love.

Pp. 115-116. P. Kretschmer, Υττῆνος. An occurrence of the name of the "eponym" of the Attic Tetrapolis, Hyttenia.

Pp. 116-126. O. Möbitz, Die Stellung des Verbums in den Schriften des Apuleius. (Extract from doctoral dissertation.) Deals especially with initial position of the verb, in Apuleius and other writers. Contains nothing essentially new.

Pp. 127-131. A. Walde, *Ivis*. Derives this poetic-dialectic word for "child" from *ἐν-γνις > *ἰγνις > *Ivis*, cf. γίνομαι, which is not dissimilated from γίγνομαι. He compares Old Irish *ingen* "girl," from *eni-gena*. The second element, from the root *gen-*, meant "Mutterschoss, Frau"; so the compound meant "Leibesfrucht."

Pp. 132-138. P. Kretschmer, Σός und andere lautnachah-

mende Wörter. The initial σ preserved (beside the phonetically regular $\tilde{\nu}\varsigma$) indicates that the word was still felt as onomatopoetic. "Solche Wörter entziehen sich den Lautgesetzen, so lange man sich der Lautnachahmung bewusst ist." So also $\sigma\bar{\imath}\bar{\gamma}\bar{a}$, $\sigma\omega\pi\tilde{\omega}$; $\sigma\bar{\iota}\bar{\alpha}$ "spit." Other imitative names for the swine. Remarks on the importance of interjections and sound-imitations. The IE. root ei -, i -, "to go," derived from the old interjection $ei!$ (Homeric etc. $\ddot{e}i$), treated as an imperative. [This suggestion would be more attractive if the imperative of the verb were ei ; but of course it was IE. **idhi*.—F. E.]

Pp. 138-149. E. Vetter, Etruskische Wortdeutungen. 1. $ce\chi a$, $ce\chi ane$, $ce\chi ase$; = supra, summus, superior. 2. -*m*, -*um*; conjunction, = Gk. $\delta\acute{e}$. 3. $lau\chi umneti$; = regius, from etr. -lat. *lucumo*, "Fürst, König." 4. $\theta alna$; a goddess, probably Juventas (Hebe). 5. $zeri$, $zeri\tilde{s}$; = omnis (omnium).

Pp. 150-152. E. Hermann, Kurze Bemerkungen zur Sprache der Vorbewohner Griechenlands. Warns against the error committed (says H.) by J. Huber in his work "De lingua antiquissimorum Graeciae incolarum," of attributing to pre-Hellenic languages of the peninsula any and every Greek word that is obscure in etymology.

Pp. 153-160. W. Kroll, Zerrissene Anapäste. Apropos of certain critiques of Exon's views, emphasizes the writer's belief in their partial truth; especially in a certain relation between word-accent and meter in early Latin.

P. 160. H. Lackenbacher, "Zur Etymologie von *filum*."

P. 160. W. Kroll, Blattfüllsel. Cicero's work is named "De natura deorum," not "de deorum natura."

Pp. 161-165. J. Zingerle, Reziproke Fernversetzung. Cases of metathesis in Greek inscriptions and papyri.

Pp. 166-167. P. Kretschmer, *'Αμολγός*. Would alter Wahrmann's explanation (above, 98 ff.) to this extent: the word meant not "udder" but "hour of milking," as the "supreme, chief moment, Höhepunkt (einer Entwicklung)."

Pp. 167-171. A. Debrunner, *'Επιούσιος*. Further defense of his interpretation, Glotta 4. 249 ff.

Pp. 171-189. W. Havers, Eine syntaktische Sonderstellung griechischer und lateinischer Neutra. Indications "dass in der griech. und lat. Volks- und Umgangssprache von alters her bei einem Teil der neutralen Nomina [as well as pronouns] eine gewisse Tendenz vorhanden war, den Nominativ-Akkusativ als allgemeinen Kasus obliquus zu verwenden." This is explained as a relic of the time when the neuters had no inflection at all.

Pp. 189-205. P. Fischer (continuation of pp. 1-11 above).

Pp. 205-213. P. Kretschmer, Alakšanduš, König von Viluša. The Boghazköi inscriptions present this personage as an ally of the Hittite King Muwattalliš (Muttališ), about 1300 B. C. K. identifies the name with Alexandros and recalls the statement of Stephen of Byzantium, s. v. Σαμυλία, that this latter was the city of a king named Μοτύλος who entertained Paris and Helen on their journey from Sparta to Troy. The name of the king K. identifies with Muttališ; and he finds in the assonance Viluša (which was a city in southern Asia Minor): Ἰλιός (*fίλιος*) an explanation of the later story which made Alexandros (originally a southern ally of Troy) into a son of the king of Troy.

Pp. 214-222. F. Stürmer (continuation of pp. 16-32 above).

Pp. 223-224. P. Linde, Homerische Selbsterläuterungen. Note on etymological fancies in the Homeric poems.

Pp. 224-241. H. Zimmermann, Schwankungen des Nominalgeschlechts im älteren Latein. These often originate in collective formations. I. Formations in collective (neut. pl.) -a. 1. *acinus*: *acina* ("Beerenkomplex, Traube"), with an "Exkurs" on transfer of neuter collectives to the feminine declension. 2. *clivus*: *cliva* (neut. pl.). 3. *intibus*: *intyba*. 4. *iocus*: *ioca*. 5. *locus*: *loca*. 6. *nervus*: *nervia*. 7. *palus*: *pala*.—II. Neut. sg. collectives in -om. 1. *forum*, a collective to *forus* "Gang," means "Summe der Gänge, Verkaufsreihen auf dem Markt." 2. *vallum*, coll. to *vallis*. 3. *buxum*, a box-hedge, to *buxus*. 4. *caseum*, always sg. and collective, to *caseus*, a single cheese. 5. *nasum* (*nassum*), coll., "nose"; later masc. *nasus* (Cicero), by influence of *oculus*.—III. From these two types of neuter collective formations there grew up an association of the neuter gender with the collective idea, so that a word might be used without change of stem-form, but with neut. instead of masc. or fem. gender, in collective sense. 1. *acus* n., "Spreu," to *acus* fem. 2. *pecus*, orig. masc., as coll. neut. 3. *penus*. 4. *volgus*, masc., the people "gewissermassen als Person" . . . "als eine Tätigkeit ausübend gedacht"; neut., "rein kollektiv . . . Allgemeinheit." (In what way is the former definition less "collective" than the latter?—F. E.)

Pp. 241-309. Literaturbericht für das Jahr 1921 (Kretschmer, Kroll, Nehring).

P. 309. E. Hermann, Hom. *ἄγρειτε*. This form is Aeolic plural to the Aeolic imperative *ἄγρει*.

Pp. 310-318. Indices (P. Linde).

P. 318. W. Kroll, Erklärung.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

PHILOLOGUS LXXVIII (N. F. XXXII) 1923.

Pp. 1-34. M. Rothstein, Catull und Lesbia. It is impossible to date the composition of the Lesbia poems by means of stylistic considerations, since the poems do not show the same finish of style. The Lesbia poems were written between the return from Bithynia and the death of the poet. About one-third of the poems of Catullus can be dated; these all belong to the period just before his death. Of the 23 Lesbia poems, 4 can be dated; these four belong to the period just before his death. Catullus was no longer young when he met Lesbia; his actual age has no reference to the youthful spirit of his poetry.

Pp. 34-87. Wilh. Andreeae, Die philosophischen Probleme in den Platonischen Briefen. This is a contribution to the question of the authenticity of the letters. There is no doubt as to the Platonic style of the letters, but one should ask whether it is probable that Plato wrote letters. It is likely that Plato did write letters in his old age as his powers waned. The authenticity of the letters may be considered as proved. An attempt is made to bring the excursuses of Letters 7 and 2 into relation with the rest of Plato's thought.

Pp. 88-130. J. F. Bensel, Hippocratis qui fertur De Medico libellus ad codicum fidem recensitus. A critical edition of the text with elaborate introduction and notes. The introduction contains numerous observations on the dialect.

Pp. 131-141. S. Brandt, Zu Lactanz. Observations resulting from the author's edition of the Divinae Institutiones prepared for the Teubner Press. Lactantius is shown to have modeled the opening of his Institutiones on that of Quintilian. Some new observations are made on Lactantius' influence on later writers, especially on Vincent of Beauvais.

Pp. 142-175. W. Süss, Ueber antike Geheimschreibemethoden und ihr Nachleben. A discussion of cryptography, dactylography and other kinds of secret writing in ancient times, in the Middle Ages (when such things especially flourished) and in modern times. It is pointed out that the ancients knew practically all of the ways of conveying information secretly that are known today. There are also observations on the "Notae Tironianae" and on other forms of stenography, an art which is shown to be closely allied to that of cryptography.

P. 176. Miscellen. 1. W. Schmid, Ἀρίξηλος Βερενίκα. The expression occurs twice, in Callimachus epigr. 51, 3, and in Theocritus, Idylls 17, 57. The epithet is as old as Homer, from whom later writers have taken it. The Berenike in question is the elder, the wife of Ptolemy I. 2. Fritz Walter, Zu den Dia-

logen Senecas. Emendations of several passages which are corrupt in the Ambrosian MS. 3. S. Eitrem, G. Gracchus und die Furien. G. Gracchus met his death *in luco Furinae*. The Optimates promulgated the tradition that this was the grove of the Furies, and that Gracchus was punished by them, since inasmuch as he had betrayed his country, he was looked upon as a parricide. (For Furina see Pauly-Wissowa, Realenc. VII, 382.)

Pp. 189-202. E. Wüst, Die Samia des Menandros. An attempt to reconstruct the plot from a new arrangement of the fragments. It is argued that Samia is the correct name of the play, since Chrysis, who is the chief character, is twice called Σαμία.

Pp. 202-229. Gustav Kafka, Zur Physik des Empedocles. It is perhaps impossible to construct a unified system for Empedocles. It is, however, possible to arrange Empedocles' theory of development into a series of five stages, 1. Development of undifferentiated organic material, *οὐλοφνεῖς τύποι*. 2. Development of isolated organs (*μονομελῆ γνία*) through differentiation of organic matter. 3. Development of independent combinations of organs, *εἴδωλοφανεῖς*. 4. Development of related combinations of organs, *όλοφνεῖς γενέσεις*. 5. Propagation of type 4 by means of the matings of the sexes. It is difficult to decide whether Empedocles extended this theory so as to include plants also. Empedocles seems to have believed that plants developed not from an organic process, but from inorganic parts. It is suggested that the experiment with the clepsydra is to demonstrate the process of breathing—the surrounding air can penetrate into the body only when the blood retreats to the heart, while the return of the blood from the heart forces the air out of the body again.

Pp. 230-280. F. Müller Jzn, Zur Geschichte der Römischen Satire. The author discusses 1. the name *satura*, 2. the associations which the Romans linked with the name. Linguistics and the history of religion are invoked as criteria. A brief conspectus is given of the principal theories on the satire. The Romans accepted the explanation that *satura* was named from its varied contents, but not all of them understood the same thing by the name. *Satura* from *satur* did not satisfy the Romans who sought for some connection with the satyr drama. How has the word *satur* = "full" come to mean *lanx deorum* = "an offering of a mixed kind?" After a discussion of the vexed passage in Livy 7, 2, the suggestion is made that Livy's material for the history of the drama comes from Accius. It may be that the *satura* is to be explained from the Etruscan, not from the Latin, since the Romans borrowed much from the Etruscans. *Ludius* is the word *lydius* which means "a Lydian,"

hence "an Etruscan player." Saturnus was an Etruscan divinity; satur-no- may have been the name of an Etruscan god of fertility brought from the original home of the Etruscans. So the word *σάτυρος* meant originally a god of fertility. The Saturnian metre was that of Saturnus, the god of vegetation. By the side of the masculine sa-tur-o stood the feminine sa-tur-a which meant fertility.

Pp. 280-301. Friederich Stählin, Der geometrische Stil in der Ilias. The Iliad was composed as a continuous work, not as a series of short chants. The "linear style" in which the Iliad is composed is illustrated by a diagram of the progress of the four days of battle. The rest of the article is an explanation of the diagram.

Pp. 301-329. Max Wallies, Textkritisches zu der aristotelischen Topik und den sophistischen Widerlegungen. Corrections of more than one hundred passages, undertaken to complete the edition left unfinished by Hans Strache at the time of his death in the war.

Pp. 330-381. Fr. Zimmermann, De Charitonis codice Thebano. The codex Thebanus (discovered 1898) is compared with the Florentinus, formerly the unique manuscript. There are 25 readings in the Thebanus which are to be preferred to those of the Florentinus.

Pp. 381-392. A. Kurfess, Lactantius und Plato. An examination of the influence of Plato on Lactantius, which shows how deeply the Christian apologist was affected by the pagan classics.

Pp. 393-428. Miscellen. 4. K. Rupprecht, Sophocles N² fr. 787. Reconstruction of the text. 5. pp. 395-6, K. Rupprecht, *'Απτερέως*. This word, formerly known only through a grammatical citation (Herodian fr. 168 L) is assured for Hesiod through the Berl. Klassiker Texte V. fr. 3, 46. The word belongs in the category with *ἀβίος*, *ἀγονος*, *ἀτεύης*, etc. 6. pp. 396-7, E. Kieckers, Zu *δρυγὴ προσπίπτει τοῦ* cum infinit. bei Thuc. II, 11, 7. Cf. Thuc. VI, 24, 3, *ἔρως ἐμπίπτει τοῦ* cum infin. The infinitive construction is used by analogy. So instead of *αἰδεῖσθαι* with the infinitive we have *αἰδὼς ἔχει τοῦ* with the infinitive. Cf. Plato, Soph. 217 D. 7. pp. 397-400, E. Kieckers, Nochmals zur Satzapposition. Evidence to support the author's view that the original case for sentence apposition was the nominative, and that the accusative in the construction came later. 8. pp. 401-403. Friedrich Bilabel, *Βόθηος*. This name (which occurs in Catal. cod. astrolog. Graec. tom. VIII, 3) is borrowed from the oriental languages. The name may be derived from the Arabic Butrus. The person referred to is to be identified with a cer-

tain BOOP whose name appears in a Coptic fragment. 9. pp. 403-413, Karl Mengis, Aus der Werkstatt des Athenaios. A comparison of Books X and XIV of Athenaeus shows that he used the same source for the two books, but augmented the material somewhat in the later one. 10. pp. 413-414, Fritz Walter, Zur Aetna V, 63. *Decus* is to be read for *deus*. 11. p. 414. Fritz Walter, Zu Seneca ad Polyb. de consolatione 11, 1. *eximi iure* is to be read for *eximere*. 12. pp. 414-421, K. Busche, Zu Senecas Dialogen. A series of 20 emendations to improve the text of books III to XII. 13. pp. 421-423, Joseph Schnetz, Zu Valerius Maximus. Five emendations. 14. pp. 423-424. August Zimmermann, Noch einmal die Duenos-Inschrift. Dressel's reading "Jovei sat Deivos" is to be preferred to Lommatzsch's "Jove sat." 15. pp. 424-428, Heinrich Swoboda, Polemarchen in Pharsalos. The anathema of the Pharsalians at Delphi (cf. Philologus LXXVII, pp. 195 ff.) belongs to the period shortly after 363, in the year between the revival of the Thessalian *kourov* by the Boeotians and the outbreak of the Sacred War. Pomtow had placed the inscription between 346 and 344.

HARRISON C. COFFIN.

UNION COLLEGE.

REVIEWS.

P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Liber Secundus. Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary, by S. G. OWEN. Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1924. x + 296 pp. \$7.00.

This is one of the most important books of the year, and doubtless one of the best. It offers the first adequate commentary on the Second Book of the *Tristia*, and on everything that is implied in it.

The Second Book is the poet's defence of himself, an apology addressed to Augustus, in which Ovid defends his Art of Love and extenuates his misconduct, in order to secure a mitigation of his sentence. It is "an argumentative address in verse," "a prose oration rendered in poetic form." Mr. OWEN analyses the rhetorical structure, and shows that the pleading is methodically arranged: Exordium, 1-26; Propositio, 27-28; Tractatio, 29-578 (Probatio, 29-154; First Epilogus, 155-206; Refutatio, 207-572; Second Epilogus, 573-8). He also considers the circumstances under which the poem was composed, and the legal technicalities concerning the poet's condemnation. As for the secret cause of Ovid's banishment, he suggests that it was probably political, that he had given some offense to Livia and Tiberius.

As for the text, Mr. OWEN holds that, while it is by no means certain, it is not so corrupt as to require much emendation. In particular, he is very sceptical as to the probability of interpolated lines: "The presumed interpolator, who derived enjoyment from inserting copy of his own into other people's works, that critics in a far-off future might exercise their ingenuity by scenting out these irrelevancies, is an ill-supported fantasy which flourished in the last century, and still dies hard." Some of the readings adopted are: 8, demi iussa; 9, vitium quoque carmine demes; 11, pretium curae; 63, quod adhuc sine fine tenetur ("which is arrested still unfinished"); 79-80, carmina ne nostris quae te venerantia libris iudicio possint candidiore legi ("with the intent that you may read with less friendly verdict such verses in my books as render you homage"); 87, quosque (not quoque); 138, privaque fortunae sunt ibi verba meae ("and in it are peculiar clauses relating to my condition"); 373, illi (locative: "there," in the *Iliad*); 419, suntque ea doctorum monumentis mixta virorum ("and these stand in the shelves beside the masterpieces of illustrious poets"); 521, in domibus nostris; 542, inquietus eques ("a knight without reproach" i. e. unchallenged, unimpeached).

The commentary is very full, and very satisfactory. It necessarily devotes a good deal of space to Ovid's long list of Greek and Latin poets, and to his account of Roman games and pastimes (471-492). The notes on syntax, metre, and diction, are based upon very wide reading and observation; for example, the notes on the technical phraseology used by Ovid with regard to verse (331-2), on the use of *ecquid* (251), on the expression *crimen habere* (498). Some of them will save the future editor of Latin poetry a vast amount of toil. The discussion of 447-462 might have referred to the excellent commentary on *Tibullus* by Kirby Flower Smith (New York, 1913). The note on *vigilatorumque laborum* (11) somehow fails to quote Statius, Th. xii. 811, *multum vigilata per annos*. The defence of *inquietus* (542) might include a reference to Claudian, *Rapt. Pros.* i. 88, *requierunt murmura ripae*. On 489 there is a hard saying: "Vases described in literature, *Theocr.* i. 27 foll. . . . seem generally to have been of metal."

As a sample of the translation, one may quote Mr. OWEN'S rendering of the difficult passage 471-484:

Some have described the skill employed in games of chance, by our ancestors regarded as no slight offence, what are the scores of knucklebones, by what cast you can secure the highest throw, or avoid the ruinous aces, of what sort are the dice in backgammon, how it is best to throw and how to place the throws, when a blot has been attacked, how the different coloured draughtsmen march forth in a straight line, when a piece caught between two adversaries is imperilled, how one advancing may be skilful to attack and rescue a piece moved forward, and retreating may move safely not uncovered; how a small board has been furnished with three marbles for each side, on which to have brought his own pieces into an unbroken line wins the player's match; and other games, all which I will not now describe, that often waste our precious hours.

W. P. MUSTARD.

The Legacy of Rome. Edited by CYRIL BAILEY. Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1923. Pp. xii + 512. \$3.25.

This is a series of essays which attempt to trace in various fields "the extent of the inheritance which the modern world owes to ancient Rome." The subjects treated are, The Transmission of the Legacy, by Cesare Foligno; The Conception of Empire, by Ernest Barker; Administration, by H. Stuart Jones; Communications and Commerce, by G. H. Stevenson; The Science of Law, by F. de Zulueta; Family and Social Life, by Hugh Last; Religion and Philosophy, by Cyril Bailey; Science, by Charles Singer; Literature, by J. W. Mackail; Language, by the late Henry Bradley; Architecture and Art, by G. McN. Rush-

forth; Building and Engineering, by Gustavo Giovannoni; Agriculture, by W. E. Heitland.

The essays are not all on the same plan; some of them really try to set forth the 'legacy,' others leave it rather to be inferred. They are all good, but perhaps the three by Messrs. Bradley, Rushforth and Bailey best bear out the promise of the general title. On p. 280 Cato's description of the ancient Rome, "sine medicis sed non sine medicina," looks like an inaccurate quotation of Pliny, xxix, 1, 11. On p. 286 Pliny's statement about dittany is mistranslated. On p. 329 Galen is cited as a Latin writer. On p. 42 Sir J. E. Sandys is called "G. A. Sandys." The book is well printed, and well illustrated, but, alas, has no index.

W. P. MUSTARD.

Le poesie liriche di Basinio (Isottaeus, Cyrus, Carmina varia),
a cura di Ferruccio FERRI. Torino: Chiantore, 1925. xx
+ 163 pp. L. 20.

Under the rather misleading title 'Poesie liriche' the editor reprints the Liber Isottaeus (mentioned *A. J. P.*, XLIV, 90-91) and adds the Cyrus and Carmina Varia. The Cyrus contains twelve elegies which refer to a girl called Cyrus. They are interesting because they borrow freely from both Ovid and Tibullus. The Carmina Varia are mainly concerned with some of the poet's distinguished contemporaries, Teodoro Gaza, Sigismondo Pandolfo Malatesta, Leonello d'Este, Filippo Maria Visconti, Maffeo Vegio, and Pope Nicholas V. There is an eclogue in honor of Nicholas V—an eclogue with a Theocritean refrain, "Dicite bucolicos, musae, mihi dicite versus." The longest and most interesting poem is addressed to Nicholas V, and explains why the poet declines to undertake a translation of Homer. It gives Basinio's version of two passages of the Iliad, and has some good criticism of Lucan, "cursu fertur qui semper eodem."

It should be added that this is the first volume of a new series of "Testi Latini Umanistici," of which the general editor is Professor Remigio SABBADINI of the University of Milan. The second volume will give 'La corrispondenza di Giovanni Aurispa,' and another early volume will be devoted to Sannazaro's *De Partu Virginis*.

W. P. MUSTARD.

Frumnorræn Málfræði. Eftir Alexander Jóhannesson, Dr. Phil. Reykjavík, 1920. Pp. v + 167.

In the present work the author has attempted to give an account of Primitive Scandinavian as found in the inscriptions using the older runes, hence in the period from the end of the 3rd century A. D. to about the year 800. The major part of the inscriptions of these centuries are, however, very short, most often of only a few words, and many grammatical forms are lacking there, as e. g., in the pronouns. Of these only the pers. pronouns *ek(a)*, *ik(a)*, and *meR*, and the dem. pron. forms *sa*, *þaim*, *þat*, and *þou*, are recorded in the inscriptions. Whereas for the nouns especially the material is fairly full. I think that the author has adopted the right method of presentation in a case of this kind; namely, that if a category is represented in the inscriptions by a single occurrence, he completes the paradigm for that particular category by starred forms based on the laws of the period as evidenced in the body of words in general. Thus under pronouns the personals and demonstratives only are given, the rest are omitted; however, for nouns, adjectives, and verbs, we have a considerable body of material. The result is, therefore, a grammar that gives a fairly complete picture of the language of the time.

There are about 200 inscriptions in the older runic series. But many of these have not been interpreted, and quite a number are apparently cut with letters standing for magic signs, and perhaps cannot therefore be read as words. The principal inscriptions were listed by Noreen in the appendix to his *Altisländische und Altnorwegische Grammatik*, ed. 3, in 1903, where 68 are given. Dr. Jóhannesson has based his grammatical presentation on these 68, plus 22 more which have seemed to him satisfactorily explained (although it may be added that some of them are as yet hardly convincingly interpreted). But after the *Frumnorræn Málfræði* appeared the new, 4th, edition of Noreen's grammar has been issued. In this the list of apparently sure readings increases the number of inscriptions there given to 95. Noreen does not have the very uncertain Farsund (Norway) inscription: *lkif*, read *Lage fape*. This should perhaps have been omitted in *Fr. Málfræði*, for the suggested forms are not Primitive Scandinavian (nor does Jóhannesson so use them (in §§ 144 and 173)). Jóhannesson appears to have overlooked the *Fæmø* (Denmark) *Bracteate*, 6th c., where, at any rate, *ek fakaR* is certain, and the *Börringe* (Sweden) *Bracteate*, 5th c., where *laukaR* is certain. I would have included these, since they were available, even though the forms are also found in other inscriptions (*laukaR* in *Skrydstrup*, and the *Skaane Bracteate*). Of very great interest is the recently discovered *Rö Rune-stone*, (Sweden) of about the year 400, which Jóhannesson could not

include, but Noreen is able to give a reading of it from a photograph and a lecture on it by Professor von Friesen. Jóhannesson has rightly omitted from his material such defective runic carvings as those of Gjersvik, ca. 400, and Hammeren, ca. 800, Norway, and one or two others. The relative importance of the different stems, etc. in the grammatical material before us is not without interest, even granting that this is conditioned in part on the character of the inscriptions. I shall note merely that of the *a*-stems there are 66 occurrences; of *i*-stems there are 11, and there are 8 *u*-stems. Of weak masculines there are 33; the feminines are about equally divided between *ō*-stems and the weak declension.

In his *Inngangur* the author first gives a brief account of the antecedents and the relationships of Old Scandinavian. This is then followed by a very good discussion, indeed, of the runes, their varying forms and names, ligatures, 'wend'-runes, etc., and the source of the different runes. Upon the latter point I am glad to see that he accepts in the main the Greek origin, as shown by Bugge and von Friessen. There should no longer be any doubt upon this. How Professor Holger Pedersen can hold to the theory of the Latin origin of every one of the runes, and stamp the theory of the (mainly) Greek origin of the runes as untenable I am at a loss to understand (*Et Blik på Sprogvidenskabens Historie*, 1916, p. 21, note). It is also true that Armenian-Georgian influence has operated, variously as Jóhannesson assumes, e. g., for *k*, the rune for *kaun*, Georgian *kan*, and *s* O. E. *sigel*, Norw. *sól*; cf., Georgian *dzil*, and *dsil*, names of *dz* and *ds*, and in some other cases.

When Jóhannesson, in discussing the question of the original home of the Indo-Europeans, finds it most likely that it was somewhere in the neighborhood of Babylonia, for the IE. system of reckoning by ten tens to the hundred seems to show influence of the Babylonian decimal system (a system of six tens),¹ this is surely giving too great weight to something that must rather be explained as Babylonian cultural influence after the IE. peoples had emigrated from their original home; the assumption also disregards overwhelming evidence that the original home was not in Asia. Another point in the introduction may here be mentioned. It is hardly quite exact to say, p. 4, that Germanic peoples² have had their homes in the Northern lands: Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, in Finland, and Estonia since the younger Stone Age, 4-5000 years before Christ. It would be better to say people of the same race as the present Germanic peoples of the North, for Germanic speech did not originate until about 1500 B. C.³ And furthermore at 4-5000 B. C. this

¹ P. 2.

² *Germanir.*

³ Certainly not much earlier.

race had apparently not reached as far north and east as Finland and Esthonia. On p. 4 the author gives a representative list of the earliest loans in Finnish from Primitive Scandinavian.⁴ I would merely add here that, after the investigations of T. E. Karsten and others of the last few years, I would certainly say that the first of these loans in Finnish must go back to 1500 B.C. or thereabouts. Some apparently antedate the Germanic sound-shift.

In the grammar proper the author's method is to be heartily commended for its clearness, as the contents for their sound scholarship. He succeeds in imparting a wealth of information with admirable brevity, as in the summary of the phonology of the vowels in stressed position, pp. 20-21. It is an excellent arrangement also to follow this up by listing under each separate vowel every runic word in which it appears; and this as here done, in a column of word-form, inscription, and date, and not compactly in a paragraph. (Thereafter pp. 36-44, the same for end syllables and those in medial position.) And so for the consonants; and in the same way the declensions and conjugations (pp. 75-103). In the outline of the older inscriptions, pp. 104-141, Noreen's method is followed (*Grammatik*, pp. 374-393), but with fuller discussion of forms, and with an almost complete bibliography (to 1920) of the literature on each separate inscription. An index of all occurring words, pp. 154-166, completes the volume. All in all this is a handbook on the runic inscriptions and on Primitive North Germanic which is indispensable to every Germanist.⁵

GEORGE T. FLOM.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte, I, Die Kunst des Altertums.

Von Anton Springer. Zwölftes, verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage nach Adolph Michaelis bearbeitet von Paul Wolters. (Alfred Kröner Verlag in Leipzig, 1923. Pp. xii, 608, mit 1078 Abbildungen im Text, 8 Farbendrucktafeln und 8 Tafeln in Lichtdruck.)

Of the two great popular German Histories of Art Lübke's *Grundriss der Kunstgeschichte, I, Die Kunst des Altertums* has recently reached its fifteenth edition, and now the twelfth edi-

⁴ These he regards as having been borrowed during the first centuries after Christ.

⁵ A German translation appeared in 1923; *Grammatik der urnordischen Runeninschriften* (*Germ. Bibliothek, I, Abt. I, 11*). Heidelberg, viii + 136 pages.

tion of Springer's *Handbuch* has appeared, only three years after the eleventh.

The *Handbuch* was the outgrowth of the *Textbuch* with which Professor Springer in 1879 accompanied his *Kunsthistorische Bilderbogen*. After the author's death in 1895 the *Textbuch* appeared in a fourth edition under the editorship of Professor Michaelis of Strasbourg, to whom the third edition of 1889 had been inscribed, under the new title of *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*. The text was no longer merely explanatory of the plates, but was expanded into a historical sketch of the entire field of art. Professor Michaelis brought out the fifth edition in 1898, the sixth in 1901, the seventh in 1904, the eighth in 1907, and had already at his death August 13, 1910 prepared the ninth for the press, the entire work then having been greatly enlarged, the section on Aegean Art being entirely rewritten. Wolters saw this edition through the press and has been editor of the subsequent ones.

The seventh edition, like the fourth of the *Textbuch*, marked an essential change in the plan and method of the work. In the earlier editions of the *Handbuch* Greek Art was presented under the three divisions—architecture, sculpture, and painting. Because of the great increase in knowledge, especially in the earlier sections, and in order to serve better the purpose of a general history of art, the volume on Antiquity gave up the topical method and presented the subject of art as it gradually developed with the progress of history, describing the artistic character of each epoch. It was no longer a book of illustrations merely, for now the text had become the chief feature of the work, the pictures interpreting the work rather than *vice versa*. Since the seventh edition the illustrative matter has steadily increased and improved, many of the earlier cuts being now omitted, while others have been added. The method of displaying several subjects on the same plate has also now been instituted.

No better critic of ancient art could have been found for these later editions of this famous work than Professor Wolters, who at present occupies the chair of archæology at Munich once held by Adolph Furtwaengler and Heinrich Brunn. As the field of ancient art has grown too extended for any one investigator to span, Dr. Wolters has taken two collaborators: Carl Schuchhardt, who has rewritten the eleven pages on the "Beginnings of Art," and F. W. von Bissing, who has revised the section on the Orient, 88 pages in length, including Egypt, Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Phoenicia and Cyprus, and Persia. Unfortunately the discovery of the tomb treasures of Tut-anckh-amen came too late to be incorporated in the section on Egypt. Wolters' own revision includes Parts A (Greece, 340 pp., in 12 sections) and B (Italy, 137 pp., in 8 sections), the major portion of the entire work.

The revision shows throughout a clear, sane, and eminently conservative view of the problems of ancient art. Naturally such a work, without annotations and written primarily for the educated lay public, could not take account of the many disputed points constantly raised by archæologists and historians of art. Consequently many of the positions taken will not be acceptable to all scholars and will, in fact, seem rather baldly and dogmatically stated. The editor's conservative spirit is perhaps best seen in his treatment of Phidias and the Parthenon marbles, and in that of the fourth century B. C. sculptors, notably Lysippus, the last of the great Greek artists. He shows little sympathy with the recent developments in the relationship between Lysippus and Scopas. To him Lysippus is still (p. 360) "ausschliesslich Erzgiesser," and his connection with the statue of Agias at Delphi (fig. 673) is "weder äusserlich bezeugt, noch stilistisch glaublich," and he regards this beautiful work as influenced by Scopasian tendencies. So the *Apoxyomenos* of the Vatican (fig. 675), which, ever since its discovery in 1749 until recently, had been regarded as the key to Lysippian style, is still (p. 361) "eine sichere Anschauung des fertigen lysippischen Stiles," and not to be replaced by the *Agias*. While admitting that the great bronze founder was influenced by Scopas he regards the well-known series of related works exemplified by the type of Heracles seen in the copy in Lansdowne House (fig. 611) and that of Meleager, of which Graef has listed nineteen copies of the head alone, as Scopasian along with Furtwaengler, Homolle, E. Gardner, and many others, rather than Lysippian with Michaelis, P. Gardner, Cultrera, the reviewer, and others. He finds the transition from Scopasian to Lysippian art in the seated Ares Ludovisi of the Museo delle Terme in Rome (fig. 674), whose facial features he believes to be Scopasian, and whose attitude is Lysippian, and refers it perhaps to the Athenian statury Leochares who was under Peloponnesian influence. On the other hand, the so-called Hermes tying on his sandals in Lansdowne House fig. 676, with the "Fagan" head, which belongs to the so-called Jason type of the Louvre, is Lysippian (p. 362), and its motif is that of a palaestra athlete laying off his sandals before exercising.

There is a good six-page bibliography of works in various languages arranged section by section, and an excellent 26 page index. Nothing but the highest praise can be given to the selection and execution of the illustrations, especially to the full-page plates. Pl. V (Polychromy of Doric Architecture) has long been a feature of the *Handbuch*, and the portrait-head from the Fayûm, now in Strasbourg (Pl. XVI) is a masterpiece of reproduction in color. Many of the text-cuts are of unusual subjects and therefore of the greatest value to the art student. We may cite from the section on the Orient, figs. 123 (The Two

Niles from Tanis, now in Berlin), 145 (Hammurapi relief in the British Museum), 184 (Rock-cut Cybele, known as the Weeping Niobe on Mt. Sipylus).

Professor Wolters has again laid the art-loving public of Europe and America under deep obligations by this authoritative new edition. We are pleased to learn that Vols. II-IV of the same edition have just appeared.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Platons Staatsschriften, griechisch und deutsch, übersetzt erläutert und eingeleitet von Dr. Wilhelm Andreea. Erster Teil: Briefe. Verlag von Gustav Fischer, Jena, 1923.

Here we have the third German translation of Plato's letters to appear in eight years. The attention given to them could hardly be exceeded if they had recently been exhumed from the sands of Egypt. Andreea is content for the most part with Burnet's text. In one passage (342b 1, 2) he strongly upholds the readings of the first hands in A and O as against Burnet's acceptance of the readings of A₃ and O₂, and points out the importance of his interpretation of this passage for an understanding of Plato's philosophy. Andreea's introduction and notes are intended for the general reader. The special value of his notes lies in his interpretation of the philosophic passages, based, as might be expected, on his previous work: *Platons Philosophie in seinen Briefen* (Leipzig, 1922). His interpretation of the well-known passages in the second, sixth and seventh epistles is independent and convincing. It will be difficult now to find anything unplatonic in the philosophy of the letters. The book is provided with a select bibliography and with indices.

Andreea accepts as genuine all the letters except the first, twelfth, and thirteenth. In this he is more critical than Apelt, who defends all except the twelfth, and less radical than Howald, who accepts as genuine and translates only the sixth, seventh, and eighth. Andreea is certainly right in rejecting the first and the twelfth letters, but the ninth ought almost certainly to go with the twelfth; and the fifth, while Platonic in style, seems most inappropriate in some of its subject matter. The genuineness of the thirteenth letter can hardly be disproved and its independence of the other letters in tone and style coupled with the presence of unexpected Platonic touches, gives it a strong claim to be considered genuine.

Aside from one or two small slips the translation is admirable, reproducing more of the tone of Plato, so far as an alien can judge, than either Apelt's or Howald's. While Apelt's translation succeeds in the attempt to render in literary German the

meaning of Plato, it does so not infrequently by sacrificing some of Plato's vigor. Howald's newspaper German, as Andreae calls it, will hardly come into competition with the other two translations. There are a few places in Andreae's translation where he renders the Greek by a paraphrase that hardly makes clear the meaning of the original.

There are some points on which there is still something to be said. In Epistle I (310a 6, 7) Burnet's reading yields better sense and rhythm than the proposed emendations. Translate: 'Diamonds and couches of silver sparkle not to the sight when weighed in the scales with a man.' In Ep. 2 (311d, e) translators have with perverse unanimity taken *τὴν ἀληθινήν* with *δόξαν* instead of with *φιλοσοφίαν* where sense and rhythm indicate that it belongs. Translate: 'The true philosophy will be better thought of and better spoken of, if we behave properly, etc.' Howald's proposal to emend by striking out *καὶ λόγον* is particularly unhappy.

The third letter should be dated after Dion's expedition, not before it, and it is clearly a public appeal in the form of a letter. There would have been no occasion for such an appeal to the Syracusan public until after Dion's initial success. The narrative portions of the seventh epistle are on the other hand clearly earlier than is assumed. They belong like the third epistle to the period when Dion was in control. Besides introduction and conclusion only the advice in the seventh epistle was composed after Dion's death. No one seems to have noted the rather close parallel between the seventh epistle and the Antidosis of Isocrates, completed shortly before it in 354 B. C. Isocrates' posthumous defense of Timotheus is tacitly a comparison of his achievements with Dion's, and Plato must have had it in mind when very little later he added his posthumous defense of Dion to the defense of his own life which appears in the seventh epistle.

Howald is right as against the others in supposing that the Hipparinus of the seventh epistle was not Dion's son. Dion's son of that name was dead as we know from Plutarch. The son of Dion mentioned in the eighth epistle was a posthumous son born to Arete in prison and rescued when Hipparinus captured Syracuse. The news that a son of Dion was alive largely inspired the eighth epistle, and that infant representative of Dion was important enough to be murdered later by Hiketas of Leontini. In Ep. 7 (328a) the nephews of Dion are almost certainly not, as Andreae and others state, Hipparinus and Nysaeus, who would probably have been referred to as Dionysius' brothers. The scholiast on Ep. 4 informs us that Dion had two sisters besides Aristomache and that they were married to two brothers of Dionysius the Elder. Their children would be

nephews of Dion and of about the same age as Dionysius the Younger. Plato surely is referring in this passage to them.

In Ep. 7 (330d 1-3) the only change required is to punctuate as a question. In Ep. 7 (335b 5) Hermann's emendation is necessary and Howald alone translates correctly, following Wilamowitz' interpretation. For the clause beginning *τυφλὸς ὦν* there have been as many solutions as interpreters, and no solution of the Greek as it stands can possibly make it read smoothly.

While Andreae's edition presents the letters of Plato in a form convenient for students, he is as far from exhausting the field as are his predecessors. Nothing approaching an exhaustive commentary on the letters is as yet in sight, yet it is safe to say that there is no greater desideratum in the field of Platonic scholarship than such a commentary. The stone which the builders rejected seems really about to become the head of the corner, and a study of the letters is fundamental to the appreciation of Plato, whether as statesman, as artist, or as philosopher.

L. A. POST.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

Studia Ammianeum: Dissertatio Inauguralis. Scripsit HARALD HAGENDAHL. Upsala: A.-B. Akademiska Bokhandeln. (= Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1921; Fil., Språkv. och Hist. Vet. 2.) Octavo. Pp. xvi, 141.

Zu Ammianus Marcellinus, von HARALD HAGENDAHL. (= Särttryck ur: Strena Philologica Upsaliensis, Festschrift tillägnad Prof. Per Persson på hans 65-Årsdag, Nyårsafton 1922.) Pp. 17.

It is a pleasure to call attention again (see *A. J. P.*, XLIV 88) to the solid and accurate work done by young Swedish investigators of late Latin. In these two booklets, Hagendahl, a talented pupil of Persson's, gives us a valuable study of Ammianus's eccentricities in vocabulary and style; he has occasion several times to correct my text, and I am glad to accept his restorations of the reading of V in such cases as *flexilis* (53, 2), *parere* (405, 5), *praestabili* (489, 10), *tantum . . . solum* (119, 14; cf. Italian *soltanto*), *trepidantes* (120, 7), *oppugnatum* (296, 11), *repetere* (360, 24 and 514, 21). Especially interesting are his observations on Virgilian reminiscences, on mixture of tenses and moods, on the construction *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ*, and on Gelenius's calm method of emending, while professing fidelity to M.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

A New Approach to the Text of Pliny's Letters. By EDWARD KENNARD RAND. Printed from the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. XXXIV, 1923. Octavo. Pp. 79-191.

The text criticism of Pliny's Letters continues to be one of the most agitated subjects in the whole field of classical philology. No sooner are RAND and Merrill well engaged than the Swedish scholar G. Carlsson (*Zur Textkritik der Pliniusbriefe*, Lund, 1922) attacks the whole foundation on which they are battling; as I suggested (*A. J. P.*, XLV 90), the beginner in the science can hardly find a better *corpus vile* for his dissection. RAND would doubtless rather have us wait for the "next chapter" he promises, than take as definitive his general classification of the MSS. Meanwhile we have here an infinitely painstaking analysis of Aldus's readings, in which RAND endeavors, with many a naughty thrust at Merrill, to prove that Aldus was not indulging in conjecture in his edition, but was using MS authority. RAND's arguments are clever and in most cases convincing; Aldus emerges as we like to think of him—a careful, thoughtful scholar, reluctant to resort to emendation. The essay contains an immense amount of valuable observations dealing with paleography and early printing; and RAND's vivacious style makes it excellent reading.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

NORTH HATLEY, QUEBEC.

Since the foregoing notice was put in type, Professor Rand has published Article II of A New Approach to the Text of Pliny's *Letters* [Harvard Studies xxxv (1924), 137-169]. Professor Clark is in Europe and not readily accessible. I have therefore taken the liberty to append a few remarks. What Professor Clark has said about the first part applies as well to the second. Attention should, however, be called to the fact that, since his Carnegie publication, Professor Rand has had access, in Merrill's edition, to the complete readings of *i*, and that he has also secured rotographs of all Book X. He has made a comparative study of the Aldine and Budaean texts of Book IX, 16 and of the Avantian, Beroaldian, Catanaean, Aldine and Budaean texts of Book X, 41-121, and is now convinced that also in IX, 16 and in X, 41-121, "whatever modification of details may appear necessary," "the Aldine edition, not the Bodleian volume, is our most trustworthy witness to the text of the ancient Codex Parisinus of Pliny's *Letters*."

C. W. E. MILLER.

Die Perfektformen auf -ere und -erunt: ein Beitrag zur Technik der spätlateinischen Kunstprosa. Von HARALD HAGENDAHL. (= Skrifter utgifna af K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala. 22:3). Upsala, Almqvist & Wiksell; Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz. 1923. 12mo. Pp. 46.

HAGENDAHL here follows up Löfstedt's observation that -erunt prevails in the more popular Latin, while -ere is foreign to it. He finds no case of -ere in Lucifer of Cagliari, for example; but the stilted Dictys Cretensis uses it almost exclusively. Augustine avoids it, Jerome is fond of it. Nearly one-half of the study is devoted to a critical examination of certain cases of this ending in Ammianus Marcellinus, in which HAGENDAHL, using Harmon's dissertation, comes to interesting conclusions and makes two or three valuable emendations.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Allen (Thomas W.) Homer. The Origins and the Transmission. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1924. Pp. 357. \$6.00.

Aristophanes. With the English Translation of Benjamin Bickley Rogers. In three volumes. London, William Heinemann; New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924. (The Loeb Classical Library.)

— Gli Acarnesi, con note da Angelo Taccone. Torino, Casa Editrice G. Chiantore, 1924. Pp. xvi + 86. L. 7.

— Les Guêpes—La Paix. Texte établi par Victor Coulon et traduit par Hilaire Van Daele. Paris, "Les Belles Lettres," 1924. 156 double pages. 18 fr.

Aristotle, Metaphysics. A Revised Text with Introduction and Commentary by W. D. Ross. New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924. 2 vols. \$16.00.

— Rhetorica by W. Rhys Roberts; De Rhetorica ad Alexandrum by E. S. Forster; De Poetica by Ingram Bywater. New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924. (The Works of Aristotle Trans. into English under the editorship of W. D. Ross, Vol. XI.) \$5.00.

Arkiv för nordisk filologi, Vol. XXXVII, No. 1. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup; Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1924.

Armini (Harry). Conlectanea Epigraphica. Göteborg, Wettergren & Kerber, 1923. 3 Kronor. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift 1923 IV.)

Bostock (J. Knight). Albertanus Brixiensis in Germany, being an account of the Middle High German translations from his didactic treatises. New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924. Pp. 123. \$1.70.

British Academy, Proceedings, Vol. X and Vol. XI. Bryce (James): Lord Reay 1839-1921. Borenus (Tancred): English Primitives. Burnet (John): Aristotle. Chambers (E. K.): The Disintegration of Shakespeare. Temple (Richard C.): William Crooke 1848-1923.

Brooks (Alfred Mansfield). Architecture. Introduction by Sir Reginald Blomfield. Boston, *Marshall Jones Co.*, 1924. (= Our Debt to Greece and Rome, 40.)

Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé. No. 6, Janvier 1925. Paris.

— of the Board of Celtic Studies. Vol. II, Part III. November 1924. University of Wales. London, *Oxford University Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. \$2.50.

Butlletí de Dialectologia Catalana. Juliol-Desembre 1923, Gener-Desembre 1924. Barcelona, *Institut d'Estudis Catalans*.

Carcopino (Jérôme). La louve du Capitole. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1925. Pp. 90.

Catalogue des Manuscrits alchimiques grecs. I: Les Parisini décrits par Henri Lebègue; III: Les Manuscrits des Iles Britanniques décrits par Dorothea Waley Singer. Bruxelles, *Maurice Lamertin*, 1924. Pp. viii + 318; vi + 81.

Charlesworth (M. P.). Trade-Routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire. Cambridge, at the *University Press*, 1924. Pp. xvii + 288.

Chiera (Edward). Sumerian Religious Texts. Upland, Pa., 1924. Pp. 41 + lxxii plates. (Crozer Theological Seminary, Babylonian Publications, Vol. I.)

Cyprien (Saint). Correspondance. Tome 1. Texte établi et traduit par Le Chanoine Bayard. Paris, "Les Belles Lettres," 1925. Pp. lv + 100 double pages. 12 fr.

Diehl (Ernestus). Inscriptiones latinae christianaee veteres. Fasc. 4. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1924. M. 3.75.

Directoire espagnol et la culture, Le. Aperçu des institutions de culture qui ont été détruites en Catalogne par le gouvernement du Directoire militaire. Paris, Société Générale d'Imprimerie et d'Édition, 1924. Pp. 31.

Duncan (Thomas Shearer). The Weasel in Religion, Myth and Superstition. (Reprinted from Washington University Studies, Vol. XII, Humanistic Series, No. 1, pp. 33-66, 1924.)

Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft. Herausg. von Alfred Gercken und Eduard Norden. I. Band, 3. Heft. Griechische Literatur. Von E. Bethe, P. Wendland, M. Pohlenz. 199 pp. 4. Heft. Römische Literatur. Von Eduard Norden. 118 pp. 5. Heft. Christliche Literatur. Von H. Lietzmann. 36 pp. 6. Heft. Sprache. Von P. Kretschmer. 121 pp. 7. Heft. Griechische Metrik. Von P. Maas. 32 pp. 8. Heft. Von Fr. Vollmer. 26 pp. 9. Heft. Griechische Epigraphik von F. Frh. Hiller von Gärtringen. Papyruskunde von W. Schubart. Griechische Palaeographie von P. Maas. Leipzig u. Berlin, B. G. Teubner, 1924.

English Association, Essays and Studies by Members of the. Vol. X. Collected by E. K. Chambers. London and New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1924. Pp. 144. \$2.50.

Epic greca e latina: L'Iliade, L'Odissea, L'Eneide. Libri ed episodi scelti, tradotti e annotati da Angelo Taccone. Torino, Società Editrice Internazionale, 1924. Pp. vii + 550. L. 14.

Évangiles, Pages choisies des. Littéralement traduites . . . et commentées . . . par Hubert Pernot. Paris, "Les Belles Lettres," 1925. Pp. 259. 12 fr. (Collection de l'Institut Néo-Hellénique de l'Université de Paris, Fasc. 2.)

Fay (Edwin Whitfield), In Memoriam. To which is appended a hitherto unpublished essay by Professor Fay on "The Indo-European Comparative." (University of Texas Bulletin, No. 2425: July 1, 1924.) Pp. 67.

Ferrari (F.) *Le poesie liriche di Basinio (Isottaeus, Cyrus, Carmina varia)*. Torino, *Casa Editrice G. Chiantore*, 1925. Pp. xii + 163. L. 20.

Fracastoro (Girolamo). *Navgerius, sive de Poetica Dialogvs*. With an English translation by Ruth Kelso and an Introduction by Murray W. Bundy. Urbana, *The University of Illinois*. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. IX, No. 3, August 1924.) Pp. 88.

Gruhn (Albert). *Der Schlüssel zur Mythologie*. Erstes Heft. Das Paradies. Erster Teil. Schöneiche bei Berlin-Friedrichshagen, *Selbstverlag*, 1924. Pp. 39.

Halliwell (James Orchard). *A Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words*. Two Volumes in One. Seventh Edition. London, *George Routledge and Sons, Ltd.*; New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.*, 1924. Pp. xxxvi + 960. \$5.00.

Harrison (Jane E.) *Mythology*. Boston, *Marshall Jones Company*, 1924. (=Our Debt to Greece and Rome, 26.)

Helbing (Robert). *Auswahl aus griechischen Papyri*. Berlin und Leipzig, *Walter de Gruyter & Co.*, 1924. Pp. 132. (Sammlung Göschen, 625.)

Hermetica. The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings which Contain Religious or Philosophic Teachings Ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus. Edited with English Translation and Notes by Walter Scott. Vol. I. Introduction, Texts and Translation. Oxford, *at the Clarendon Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. 549. \$10.00.

Hespéris. *Archives berbères et Bulletin de l'Institut des Hautes-Études Marocaines*. Année 1923, 4^e Trimestre; Anné 1924, 1^{er} et 2^e Trimestres. Paris, *Larose*.

Homer, *The Iliad*. With an English Translation by A. T. Murray. Vol. I (Books I-XII). London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1924. (The Loeb Classical Library.)

Howe (George) and Harrer (Gustave Adolphus). *Greek Literature in Translation*. New York and London, *Harper & Brothers Publishers*, 1924. Pp. xiv + 642. \$4.00.

Inter-America. English: Vol. VII, No. 6, August, 1924; VIII, Nos. 1, 2 and 3, October, December 1924, January 1925. New York, *Double-day, Page & Company*.

Journal of Education and The School World. September, 1924, till February, 1925. London, *William Rice*.

Julien (L'Empereur). *Oeuvres complètes*. Tome 1; 2^e partie: Lettres et fragments. Texte revu et traduit par J. Bidez. Paris, *Les Belles Lettres*, 1924. Pp. xxiv + 258. 20 fr.

Library Association. *The Subject Index to Periodicals 1921*. I. Language and Literature. Part 1, Classical, Oriental and Primitive. London: *The Library Association*, 1924. Pp. 23. 2s. 6d. net.

Livy. *Ab Urbe Condita libri*. Erklärt von W. Weissenborn und H. J. Müller. Dritter Band, Erstes Heft, Buch VI-VIII. Neubearb. von Otto Rossbach. Sechste Auflage. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1924. Pp. iv + 328. 5.40 M.

Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*. With an English Translation by W. H. D. Rouse. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1924. (The Loeb Classical Library.)

Mandeville (Bernard). *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits*. With a Commentary, Critical, Historical, and Explanatory by F. B. Kaye. Oxford, *at the Clarendon Press*, 1924. 2 vols. 8°. Pp. exlvi + 412; 482.

McDaniel (W. B.) *Roman Private Life and its Survivals*. Boston, *Marshall Jones Co.*, 1925. Pp. xii + 203. (= Our Debt to Greece and Rome, 43.)

Meillet (A.) et Vendryes (J.) *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*. Paris, *Édouard Champion*, 1924. Pp. xiv + 684.

Merrill (William A.) *The Metrical Technique of Lucretius and Cicero*. Berkeley, *University of California Press*. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 7, No. 10, pp. 293-306.)

Murray (Gilbert). *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, being a course of lectures delivered at Harvard University. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Oxford, *at the Clarendon Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. xxiv + 356. \$4.70.

Muséon. *Revue d'Études Orientales*. Tome XXXVII (Cahiers 3-4). Paris, 1924.

Mustard (W. P.) *The Elegies of Antonio Geraldini*, Edited, with Introduction and Notes. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1924. Pp. 84. \$1.50.

New English Dictionary. Edited by Sir James A. H. Murray, etc. Vol. X. Ti-Z. WHISKING-WILFULNESS. By C. T. Onions. New York, *Oxford University Press*, American Branch, October 1924. 5 sh.

Ormerod (H. A.) *Piracy in the Ancient World: an Essay in Mediterranean History*. Liverpool, *The University Press*, 1924. 10sh. 6d.

Pelzer (Auguste). Un traducteur inconnu: Pierre Gallego, franciscain et premier évêque de Carthagène (1250-1267). Roma, *Tipografia del Senato*, 1924. (Estratto dalla *Miscellanea Fr. Ehrle I.* Roma, Biblioteca Vaticana, 1924, pp. 407-456.)

Petrarca (Francesco). Dalle Rime Sparse, a cura di Enrico Carrara. Firenze, *Società An. Editrice "La Voce"*, 1924. Pp. 73. L. 3.25.

Philological Quarterly, Vol. IV, No. 1. January 1925. Published at the *University of Iowa*, Iowa City, Iowa.

Plutarco, Le Vite di, nuovamente tradotte a cura di Arturo Solari. Alessandro e Cesare: Traduzione, Introduzione e Note di A. Taccone. Bologna, *Nicola Zanichelli*, 1925. Pp. 153. L. 9.

Postgate (J. P.) *A Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek*. Liverpool, *University Press*; London, *Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd.*, 1924. Pp. x + 96. 10/6.

Propertius. Die Elegien. Erklärt von Max Rothstein. Zweiter Teil, Drittes und Viertes Buch. 2. Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1924. Pp. 406. 7.50 M.

Ranulf (Svend). Der eleatische Satz vom Widerspruch. Kristiania, *Gyldendalske Boghandel*, 1924. Pp. 222.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Vol. XXXIV Julio-Diciembre 1924, Núms. 3 y 4. Habana, *Imprenta "La Propagandista."*

Robinson (David M.) *Sappho and her Influence*. Boston, *Marshall Jones Company*, 1924. (= Our Debt to Greece and Rome, 2.)

Roemer (Adolph). Die Homerexegese Aristarchs in ihren Grundzügen. Bearb. und hrsg. von Emil Belzner. Paderborn, *Ferdinand Schöningh*, 1924. Pp. xiv + 286. 10 M. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, XIII. Bd., 2/3. Heft.)

Roland, The Song of. Newly Translated into English with an Introduction by Jessie Crosland. London, *Chatto & Windus*; New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1924. Pp. xxiii + 143. \$1.85.

Rose (H. J.) *The Roman Questions of Plutarch. A New Translation with Introductory Essays and a Running Commentary*. New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. 220. \$4.20.

Ruth (Thomas DeCoursey). *The Problem of Claudius. Some Aspects of a Character Study.* J. H. U. Diss. Baltimore, *The Lord Baltimore Press*, 1924. Pp. 138.

S. P. E., Tract No. XVIII: Fowler (H. W.), Subjunctives. Robert Bridges, *Poetry in Schools.* Open Court on 'Alright.' New York, *Oxford University Press*, American Branch, 1924. Pp. 26. \$.85.

Schmidt (Alfred). *Drogen und Drogenhandel im Altertum.* Leipzig, *Johann Ambrosius Barth*, 1924. Pp. viii + 136.

Schönfeld (M.) *Historiese Grammatika van het Nederlands.* Schets van de Klankleer, Vormleer en Woordvorming. Zutphen, *W. J. Thieme & Cie.* Pp. xxxi + 242. 5.90 fr.

Smith (Gertrude). *The Administration of Justice from Hesiod to Solon.* Privately printed, 1924. Pp. 80.

Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology. Thirty-eighth Annual Report. An Introductory Study of the Arts, Crafts, and Customs of the Guiana Indians. By Walter Edmund Roth. Pp. 745.

Sophoclis Fabulae. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit A. C. Pearson. New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. \$1.85.

Strabo. *The Geography of, with an English Translation by Horace Leonard Jones.* In eight volumes. Vol. III. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1924. (The Loeb Classical Library.)

Streitberg-Festgabe. Hrgs. von der Direktion der Vereinigten Sprachwissenschaftlichen Institute an der Universität zu Leipzig. Leipzig, *Markert & Petters*, 1924. Pp. xv + 441. Rm. 30.

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Vol. II. Lugduni Batavorum, A. W. Sijthoff, 1924. Pp. 80.

Taylor (Alfred Edward). *Platonism and its Influence.* Boston, *Marshall Jones Company*, 1924. (= Our Debt to Greece and Rome, 19.)

Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg. Hrsg. von Fritz Saxl. II. Vorträge 1922-1923. I. Teil. Leipzig, Berlin, *B. G. Teubner*, 1924. Pp. 239.

Weekley (Ernest). *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern English.* New York, *E. P. Dutton and Company*, 1924. Pp. xx + 983 columns.

Wenley (R. M.) *Stoicism and its Influence.* Boston, *Marshall Jones Company*, 1924. (= Our Debt to Greece and Rome, 21.)

Westergaard (Elisabeth). *Studies in Prefixes and Suffixes in Middle Scottish.* London and New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. xii + 135. \$4.20.

Wiener Studien. XLIII. Band. Jahrgang 1922-23. 2. Heft. Wien, Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky A. G., 1924.

Wright (Joseph) and Wright (Elizabeth Mary). *An Elementary Historical New English Grammar.* London and New York, *Oxford University Press*. Pp. xi + 224. \$2.35.

Year's Work in English Studies (The). 1923. Edited for The English Association by Sir Sidney Lee and F. S. Boas. London and New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1924. Pp. 269. \$2.50.